

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXIII.—NOVEMBER, 1880.

THE SECOND GENERAL PRESBYTERIAN
COUNCIL.

IT was apparent from the beginning, or rather, from before the beginning, that the Presbyterian Council at Philadelphia was to be an important and imposing gathering. The language of the newspapers in announcing it made that plain. They talked of it as a convention of far more than ordinary interest; and the very copious accounts which they gave of its proceedings, as well as the vast audiences that attended its sessions, showed that their estimate of the public interest was not overcharged. The prevalence of such a vivid interest was the more remarkable because the meeting of the Council took place close on the crisis of the presidential election. On the first Saturday of the sessions, a scene was presented in Philadelphia that can never be forgotten by any who witnessed it. A torchlight procession of thirty thousand supporters of the candidature of General Garfield paraded the streets for four or five hours, wonderfully orderly in its movements, and singularly picturesque under the glare of the torches, the ruby glow of Bengal lights, the mid-day brightness of electric stars, and the many-coloured radiance of rockets and fireballs that seemed for the moment to create new firmaments before which the old stars grew pale and insignificant. A similar procession had taken place, on the previous Saturday, of the supporters of General Hancock. That, in such a political crisis, a great ecclesiastical gathering should create such general interest, especially in the secular press, was therefore a surprising and very noteworthy circumstance. Among the sources of this interest we may state the largeness of the Presbyterian population of Philadelphia; the high estimation in which the Presbyterian body is held in the United States; and the increased weight which came from the presence of so many ministers and elders from other parts, and especially from some of the primeval seats of modern Presbyterianism; the natural gratification of the American people at the presence of so

many friends from the old country ; and the lively working of the Christian instinct of brotherhood, which seemed to become warmer and wider as it obtained gratification—increase of appetite seeming to grow by what it fed on. Perhaps we may add that the state of unrest, in regard to religion, of a portion of the secular population, caused a wistful look to be turned towards a gathering from which, more perhaps than from any other, they might hope to obtain some light. But be the causes what they may, it is certain that the interest felt in this meeting was quite exceptional. Whatever other inferences may be drawn from this fact, every one must see in it a justification of the movement which led to the Council—must see that the idea of an Ecumenical Presbyterian Alliance was in full harmony with the general sentiment and the general longing, and was carried into effect not a day too soon.

If a superstitious spirit in the matter of omens had prevailed, the successive deaths among those charged with making preparations for the Council would have been counted marks of a frowning Providence. Of the ministers and elders that had been appointed in Edinburgh, in 1877, as a committee of arrangements, some seven or eight had been called to another world ; and the list embraced such names as those of Rev. Dr. Beadle, Philadelphia, chairman ; Rev. Dr. Boardman, also of Philadelphia, his successor in office ; and Rev. Dr. William Adams, of New York, who had undertaken to preach the sermon at the opening of the Council. In addition to these bereavements, the convener of an important committee, Principal Lorimer, and other influential friends of the movement had also been called away. It was impossible not to feel deep sadness at the loss of so many honoured men, on whom so much seemed to depend. But, as in a well-equipped and brave army, when one standard-bearer falls there is another man beside him to take the colours, and if he should fall and his successor after him, their places would in like manner be filled at once ; so, in the Presbyterian Alliance, men admirably qualified were found to take the places of their brethren, and were perhaps stimulated to a fuller and higher exercise of their powers by the fact that they had to come in the room of officers of such ability. Notwithstanding the breaches made by death, such men as Dr. Schaff, Dr. Mathews, and Mr. Junkin, were spared to mature the preparations in various departments, the first two being chairman and secretary, respectively, of the Programme Committee ; while Dr. Breed and Dr. Paxton were ready, when called on, to do what Dr. Beadle or Dr. Boardman on the one hand, and Dr. Adams on the other, would have done if they had been spared. Before the Council met formally, a very cordial reception from the citizens of Philadelphia was given them in the Academy of the Fine Arts. The Governor of the State and the Mayor of the city were there with cordial words of welcome, and the citizens so crowded the apartments that for a time it was hardly possible to move about.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

The keynote of the Council fell to be raised by Dr. Paxton of New York. A more remarkable audience than that which clustered around him in the Academy of Music could hardly have been found in any part of the globe. It was the morning of a week-day, yet there assembled not fewer than four thousand persons, mostly of mature age, and evidently of sober-minded and earnest character, including many hundred ministers and elders, filling the great area, and massed in compact and solid semicircles in all the four tiers of galleries that rise from floor to ceiling in that magnificent building. It was evident that it must be an American preaching—for pulpit there was none, only a little table with gilt pedestal and marble slab on which a large Bible lay. Of Dr. Paxton's sermon we shall only say that it presented a remarkable combination of all that was most appropriate for an occasion so rare in the history of the Protestant Church. Complete in structure and finished in language, it was delivered without a vestige of a note, the preacher moving about at his ease over a considerable part of the stage, and holding and handling his audience with the easy power of a master. His discourse was designed to indicate the most characteristic features of Presbyterianism, and of these he dwelt on several—on the place it gives to the person of Jesus Christ; on the prominence, in its history, of *testimony* for Him, carried often to death; on its love of liberty, its alliance with education, its catholicity of spirit, and its missionary aspirations. There was just enough of the ecclesiastical element to justify Presbyterians for maintaining their particular organisation, while a catholic spirit reigned over the whole discourse, and the spiritual aspirations of a devout heart showed that preference for a special system had not blinded the preacher to the great realities which all systems must subserve. Once or twice a suppressed murmur of applause showed how near the preacher had come to the hearts of his audience. It was instructive to notice that the occasions when the feeling became so strong were, when he touched on Presbyterian struggles for liberty, and when, in contrast with Romish and High Church exclusiveness, he enlarged on the generous spirit that finds Christ's Church in all faithful denominations, and honours and welcomes their ministers as brethren in the Lord. Not even an enemy could have said that the discourse was the offspring of ecclesiastical imperialism, or that it fostered the spirit—"I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing." On the contrary, its tendency was to make the thrilling memories of the past foster, not pride, but humility and holy purpose; teaching us to forget the things that are behind, and reach forth unto the things that are before.

It had been found impossible at first to secure the Academy of Music for the ordinary sessions of the Council, but another hall had been prepared for them. The Horticultural Hall was the largest that could be got in Philadelphia, and it happened that it was close to the Academy. Entering this large oblong building, a new surprise awaited the delegates.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

The tall spaces between the windows of the building had been filled up by a kind of ecclesiastical tapestry, or series of illuminated records, on which the delegates from different countries found a memorial of some of the most memorable events in their Church history. Thanks to the spirit and persevering energy of Dr. M'Cook, of Philadelphia, a kind of museum of Church history was thus spread out before the very eyes of the Council, reminding them of the glorious historical memories that throw an undying halo round many of the Churches, and calling on their present representatives to

"Snatch from the ashes of their sires
A portion of their former fires."

Four of these illuminated records went far back into the past. Under the burning bush, the Scottish compartment commemorated the "CULDEES" on its highest line; that of Ireland, also under the burning bush, but in a different form, emblazoned "IRELAND'S PRIMITIVE PRESBYTERS—365 churches, 365 bishops, 3000 elders;" on the opposite wall, one compartment, under the emblem of the candle, with the motto, "Lux lucet in tenebris," bore the honoured name of VAUDOIS; and another, under the cup—a memorial of their struggles with Rome—together with their motto, "Veritas omnia vincet," the not less honoured name of HUSSITES. Presbyterianism has not a little pride of ancestry—a worthy and genuine pride, for her ancestors have been men honoured by God, and a blessing to the world; with such forefathers, she is not prepared to accept the post of an ecclesiastical *parvenu*. The other compartments were devoted to Geneva, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, England, and France. Many an honoured name was emblazoned on each shield, and many a glorious deed. The martyrs, and others who had rendered eminent service to the Church, were conspicuous—especially in the compartments of the Netherlands and France, though in their case the names could not be given; but mention was made of 100,000 martyrs in the one, and 70,000 Huguenot martyrs and 500,000 exiles in the other. It was impossible not to be touched with this very graceful tribute of America to the countries and Churches of the Old World. With much good taste she left out the stripes and stars in this exhibition, and claimed no compartment for the history of her own Church. Nor did she lose anything by this act of self-suppression. The thought was made the more vivid that America is the heir of all—that she has all the European Churches in her spiritual ancestry, and that in her Presbyterian communions are many who claim descent from Scotch Covenanters and English Puritans, from French Huguenots and Dutch martyr-patriots, from Swiss, German, Irish, and, we believe, even Bohemian and Italian forefathers. It was interesting to find America thus casting her eye with such interest and respect to the past, as if it were her earnest desire that in the New World the cause for which so many noble lives were given in the Old should receive a new consecra-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

tion and development, and that the country which claims in size to be nearly equal to Europe should aim at reproducing the spirit, if not the deeds, that have made them so famous. In the welcome addressed by Dr. Breed to the delegates at the first business meeting, a kind of paraphrase or commentary was presented of the events portrayed on the walls of the hall. He roamed round the world, welcoming the strangers from every land, and making them feel that though they were many they were members of one body, and that it was Philadelphia—the city of brotherly love—that had set before them an open door.

Coming now to the Council itself, its composition indicated very conclusively the wide-spread and increasing interest in the Council among the various Churches. The group whose representation fell most decidedly below that at Edinburgh in 1877 was the Continental. It is not wonderful that only six ministers from the Reformed Churches of the European Continent were able to find their way to Philadelphia. But it is a striking fact that most of those whose representatives were there were comparatively small and struggling Churches. The Reformed Church of France does not fall under this category,—at least not wholly; but Bohemia, Belgium, the Vaudois, the Free Italian Church, and Spain are among the least of the thousands of Presbyterianism. The presence of their representatives in far-away Philadelphia was like a plaintive reduplication on the old Macedonian cry, only that instead of coming to a single apostle with his scanty group of assistants, the cry came to an assembly representing many millions of the most able and vigorous members of the Christian Church. Was the presence of this handful of representatives from the poorest class of Churches an honour or a discredit? For ourselves, we thought of the venerable pastor in the days of the Roman persecutions, who, when summoned to produce the jewels of his church, brought out the poor, and said, "These are the jewels of our church." Never did poverty seem more honourable than in that brilliant Philadelphia Council. What made Bohemia poor? or Italy? or Belgium? or Spain? It was only necessary to refer to the historical drapery in the Horticultural Hall to obtain a thrilling reply. Their poverty was a souvenir of awful persecutions and noble struggles, a memorial of men that loved not their lives unto death, and who form no insignificant detachment of the noble army of the martyrs—of those who have come out of great tribulation and are now before the throne. In the view of faith, the Council had no class of representatives more worthy of honour than those that came from these smallest of the Churches; it remains to be seen whether it fully appreciated their claims, or whether it will turn out that the whole benefit to be derived by them from their rich relations is a pious exhortation to be "warmed and fed."

The United Kingdom sent over forty-seven ministers and twenty elders, the greater part from the land of Knox, but a goodly representation too from Ireland, and a small one—much too small—from England and from Wales. In fact, it was not easy to understand how a Church

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

which has the reputation of being so pre-eminently rich in excellent elders as the Presbyterian Church of England, had not a single lay representative in the Council. Of delegates from the United States there were present seventy-one ministers and fifty-two elders (including a few who for the nonce were allowed to represent other Churches); while from the British Colonies there were present fifteen ministers and six elders, but if the distance traversed by some of these was taken into account in estimating the interest of their several Churches, they would be counted equal to double or treble their number. The total number of delegates present was a hundred and thirty-eight ministers and seventy-eight elders—in all, two hundred and sixteen. But to these there fall to be added forty-three ministers and elders whom the Council invited to sit with them during their meetings—making a complete total of 259. If the number of ministers and elders who were present as spectators were added, the figures would be more than doubled. Considering that the delegation of each Church embraced many of its ablest men, it is no wonder that when the Committee came to prepare a programme, they found themselves in an *embarras de richesses*. The programme seems to have baffled all the efforts of the Committee to shorten it; and when it came out, it was of such magnitude that to read all the papers in full would have occupied the whole time of the Council. With all the limitation that could be enforced as to the time for each speaker, it was found most difficult to obtain reasonable space for the general business, and for discussions on the subjects of the papers. By a considerable effort, discussion was found practicable on a few of the subjects; but the discussion was often separated by a whole day or by two days from the reading of the papers. The introduction of discussion was an improvement on the proceedings at the Edinburgh meeting, but it only served to show how much more interesting the Council would have been if time had been provided for the discussion of each topic immediately after it was introduced. It is the appointment of Providence that many of our most valuable lessons are learned through our blunders, and the manifest inconvenience of a too crowded programme will teach the next Programme Committee to reduce the bill of fare by at least one-half. People cannot be always eating—some reasonable time must be allowed for digestion. This lesson, we are assured, will not be lost on the Irish brethren, who will have the chief part in arranging the work of the next Council; but we cannot withhold our sympathy from the unfortunate Committee, who will have to do many an unpopular act by declining papers not a few, believed by their authors to be altogether indispensable to a successful Council. Two meetings a-day, and two papers at each meeting with discussions arising out of them, not to mention reports of Committee and other business, will probably be found amply sufficient for the due occupation of the time.

Generally, the papers were of two classes—theoretical and practical. The theoretical papers embraced some very deep and supremely import-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

ant theological topics—infidelity and agnosticism, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, the inspiration of Holy Scripture, regeneration, future retribution. Coming nearer to the practical region, but having their chief interest in the principles they laid down, were papers on the Ceremonial, the moral, and the emotional in Christian life and worship; Religion in secular affairs; Religion in its relation to science and philosophy; Creeds and Confessions; Admission to sealing ordinances; Baptism; Principles of Presbyterianism; Ruling elders. The practical papers were very multifarious. Some were of a more specially ecclesiastical character than others—Church extension, Sabbath observance, Sabbath schools, Evangelism, the Pulpit, the Continental Churches, and very specially Foreign Missions. Other papers went into questions not exclusively ecclesiastical—Influence of the Gospel on employers and employed; Christianity the friend of the working classes; Family religion; Bible revision; Temperance; Popular amusements; Education; Systematic beneficence; Civil and religious liberty. In all of these departments, many contributions were made of the highest ability. It could not be said that any important subject suffered from palpably inadequate advocacy. There can be no reasonable doubt that from so many first-class papers and addresses, much good may be looked for. Reported as these papers were at great length by all the secular journals, and spread far and near over the American continent, the position of the Presbyterian Churches cannot fail to have been generally raised, and their claims to respect deepened. Over America especially we may reasonably believe that the Presbyterian Church has got a great impulse, and that its preachers occupy a more commanding platform to-day than they did three months ago. The world has come to know more of what may be called *Origines Presbyterianæ*. It has got glimpses of a far distant Presbyterianism—in the earliest Christian ages, as delineated in the New Testament; it has come to know something of the wisdom, the learning, the courage and self-denial of the men who restored it at the Reformation, in place of the substitute provided by the Church of Rome; it has been seen how surely it allies itself with education and with liberty, with the spirit of industry and national prosperity and progress, and with whatever is most solid and substantial in human character. This is no slight result of the meetings of the Council. Nor were these illustrations of Presbyterianism made in an offensive or sectarian spirit. It was made evident that the Presbyterian system was cherished as a means to a great spiritual end; and the acceptance which the Council gained in the eyes of all denominations was the best testimony to its catholicity.

But more important results than these have been achieved. In an age of much unrest and movement, it was made apparent that men of much learning and ability have still something to say for those great vital truths which have been the foundation of the Church's life and hope in ages past, and are not to be abandoned now, like Hebrew old

clothes. We bear in mind that there are some men who cling to the old paths in a spirit of mere blind traditional orthodoxy, and the Council may perhaps contain some such in its ranks. But it was in no such spirit that Principal Cairns, for example, vindicated the vicarious sacrifice of Christ—in no such spirit that he referred to the world-wide efficacy and marvellous charm of the doctrine of the cross, and the wonderful thrill sent through all pious hearts by the truths expressed in such hymns as “Just as I am, without one plea,” “I lay my sins on Jesus,” “Free from the law, O happy condition.” Nothing that took place during all the proceedings of the Council seemed to draw out the feeling of the great assembly more profoundly than the appeal of Dr. Cairns on this subject. It seemed to go right to every heart, and the deep pathetic response of the assembly made it plain that the atonement of our blessed Saviour is still cherished as the very hope of the Church, the very anchor of the soul.

There were in the Council representatives of a somewhat progressive school. Dr. Hitchcock, of Union Seminary, in a paper on “the Ceremonial, the Moral, and the Emotional in Christian Life and Work,” gave forth his views very freely, and with great ability, in favour of certain modifications in our worship, our manner of teaching, and even in some of our ideas of Christian life. Principal Grant, of Kingston, went beyond Dr. Hitchcock, at least in the enthusiasm and confidence with which he sketched his church of the future. Mr. Macdonnell, of Toronto, pled hard for liberty in the matter of creeds. Professor Bruce, of Glasgow, was willing, without inquiry, to open the door of the Council to the Cumberland Presbyterians, whose doctrinal position is suspected by many. Professor Flint indicated his belief that the theological fermentation now going on is working for the advantage of theology, and that the idea of arresting such speculation by the mere force of discipline is greatly to be deprecated. How were such views received? Wherever the speaker possessed the full confidence of the Council, his views were listened to with approval by some, with great respect by all, and perhaps with a conviction on the part of many that there was more to be said in favour of them than they had previously imagined. Some of the speakers startled their audience by an impetuosity of manner and a vagueness of statement which made men ask, Where would they stop? Undoubtedly the strong feeling of the Council was conservative.

In one sense, it was perhaps rather too conservative. It seemed at times to be thought enough to vindicate the old ways, without taking into much account the special difficulties of men of undoubted sincerity and unblemished character in the present age, whom it is most desirable to conciliate and unwise to repel. We are here on delicate ground, but we will illustrate our meaning by examples from another department. We take two of the most popular papers, delivered on the same evening, in the Academy of Music—one on the Temperance question by Hon. W. E. Dodge, the other on popular amusements, by Rev. Dr. Cuyler. The

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

writers are both men of the highest ability and character. Yet their papers were rather strong pleadings for somewhat extreme positions, than attempts to guide conscientious men who might have difficulties on the subjects discussed. In a Church Council composed of brethren, it seems more proper to try to deal with waverers or even opponents in the way of frank allowance for their difficulties and honest brotherly attempts to overcome them, than in the way of vehement affirmation of the positions from which it may be their weakness or their misfortune to recoil. So with doctrinal subjects. The present age demands a singular combination of frankness and decision in dealing with these. There are undoubtedly some able and excellent men who have difficulties here. They look at many doctrines from a new point of view. They contemplate the same end as their brethren—the advancement of spiritual life, “the perfecting of the saints, . . . till we all come in the unity of the faith . . . to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.” They do not regard some doctrines, as these are commonly put, as conducive to this end. Now, powerful demonstrations of doctrine from the old point of view do not satisfy such men. They do not afford them the help they crave. Nor will such men be helped till their brethren go to the same standpoint as theirs, and, fully appreciating their position, try to guide them to just conclusions. It is easy to accumulate arguments to show that men who have once subscribed a creed should never swerve from it in any particular. But this affords no help to those who feel that they should be free to welcome light whenever it comes to them, and that they ought not to be thrown roughly overboard for trying to be conscientious. It is a great service to establish the inspiration of Scripture as Dr. Humphrey did; but even his demonstration does not satisfy many who cannot get over its verbal discrepancies. We think one of the greatest achievements of an ecclesiastical council would be to serve as a *helping* council. We admit that very few men are capable of writing papers for councils or articles for journals that are really fitted to help young inquiring minds out of their difficulties. Probably little can be done in this way without longer time than the Council could afford, and more prolonged, friendly discussion. Brethren would need fuller time to state and explain their views, and to defend them from misconstruction.

For our own part, we should be sorry that the Council should ever want representatives of the inquiring school, so long as it is a real power within our borders, and so long as the great essentials of the faith are maintained. It is obvious that the new world has not felt the influence of this new school of inquiry as it has come to be felt in the old. Such influences seem to move slowly over the surface of the earth, but it is probable that the tide will reach America one day. It is one of the great problems of the future. What will be the result of it? Will the old doctrines be swept away, or will the mode of stating them only undergo a change? That we are in a transition age is but too apparent; that much patience is demanded of the

orthodox section can hardly be denied, as well as much tact and sanctified skill in dealing with men who appear to be devout and earnest, and who would be of eminent value if brought more completely into line with their brethren in the service of Christ.

A very vital question must present itself in any estimate of this Council—What has it done? In answering this question, we shall probably be thought somewhat “pawky” if we begin by saying that sometimes unreasonable expectations are entertained on this head. The Council is an attempt to bring together some fifty different Church organisations scattered over the globe, in many lands. What reasonable man would expect that at the first or second meeting such a body should be found quite ready for united work? Some of us may remember that in the Crimean war, when the troops of England, France, Turkey, and Sardinia came together, and tried to work together, the first result was a very great mess. Undoubtedly, it is wiser that the first few meetings of Council should be of a tentative character, that the different sections of the Alliance should try first to know and understand each other, that they should learn to rid themselves of what is cumbrous and useless, and find out by experience what can be done, and how it may be done best. Pre-eminently is this true of an Alliance whose two arms are separated from each other by an ocean of three thousand miles. It was inevitable, in such circumstances, that the first two general meetings should be wholly tentative, the one on the one side and the other on the other side of the Atlantic. These meetings being past, the third Council, which is appointed to be held at Belfast in the year 1884, may reasonably be expected to make an advance on the practical activity of the Alliance. Certain it is that the Belfast Council will have an advantage in the great prestige the movement has now acquired. It may reasonably proceed on the conviction that the Council is an established fact, not a mere floating vision, and that if it is to have long life and prosperity, it must work for them. “If any man will not work neither shall he eat” is an apostolic maxim; modifying it, we may say, If an Alliance *cannot* work it cannot live.

But has there been no practical good resulting from this Philadelphia Council? Is it nothing that, for ten crowded days, representatives of so many Churches have been seen by the world discussing very vital topics with no little freedom, but with great substantial harmony and without any breach of brotherly love? Is it nothing that the fundamental evangelical truths have been powerfully vindicated, that great ecclesiastical principles have been clearly asserted, that many practical questions have been admirably ventilated, and that all this has been done in a becoming spirit of solemnity and prayer? Is it nothing that so favourable a view of Presbyterian deliberation has been presented to the world, arresting the attention of the whole community, and drawing to its sessions Episcopalians, Baptists, Independents, and Methodists—yea, even bishops, who have expressed themselves as both edified and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

delighted? Is it nothing that so many brethren have seen each other in the flesh, and grasped each other by the hand, and gained that mutual knowledge and love which will give a new interest and power to their respective books, and articles, and speeches, and Church-meetings, and whatever else they may be identified with? Is it nothing that so many strong links of friendship have been formed between the various countries—links which, if national quarrels were to break out, would certainly have a powerful influence in averting strife and maintaining peace? Is it nothing that so many brethren have received new impulses to activity and new inspirations of hope, and that all have had their hearts enlarged, and its purest aspirations deepened, through the sense of fellowship with so large a family and so interesting a *brotherhood*, embracing so many mighty men? No doubt there are prigs incapable of estimating the effect of these subtle but powerful forces; there are men whose timber heads can see no good in anything that cannot be turned into statistical columns. But for our part, if the Presbyterian Alliance did no other good than this, we should deem it worth all the trouble it has cost. Yes, Calvin would have crossed his ten seas to bring about such a result. If the Alliance leads fifty churches to work with more heart and hope, it cannot be said to have been useless. What is the use of family gatherings at Christmas or New Year's day? How can you put the results of these into statistical columns? Yet would not families miss them sadly? If you lubricate the wheels of society, if you sweeten its breath, if you brighten its sky, you do a real good, and your labour is not in vain.

But we have more to say on this point. It was apparent from the movements of that remarkable barometer which so truly tells the feeling of a great assemblage, and which reporters for the press term "applause," that the Council itself was deeply impressed with the importance of acquiring a character for practical, beneficial work. Whenever any such sentiment was expressed, it was heartily cheered. It was partly as the fruit of this conviction that the Committee on the Churches of the European Continent started their scheme for augmenting the salaries of the Waldensian pastors, in regard to which it was announced that six thousand pounds, or half the sum needed, had been virtually subscribed on the other side, chiefly in Scotland; while an appeal was made to the United States, with England, Ireland, and the Colonies, to furnish the other half. Will those who croak that the Alliance does nothing, be good enough to lend a hand in this cause? Partly for the same reason, it was proposed that next year that Committee should in some way manifest its sympathy with the Churches of Bohemia and Moravia, when they come to celebrate the centenary of their Act of Toleration. Then, in regard to Foreign Missions, the duty and blessedness of co-operation are deeply felt and fully acknowledged; but co-operation without consideration would be a somewhat foolish proceeding, and now matters are put in such train that the desired co-operation may reasonably be looked

for soon. Have we not had interesting notices of such co-operation in China, in Japan, in India, in New Hebrides, brought about by missionaries on the spot? The thing has been begun by a kind of internal spontaneous action, and without needing the hand of Churches to be applied *ab extra*. Shall we not hear more of this before next meeting of Council? Shall we not hear that in all parts of the country, Presbyterian missionaries have drawn together, and that all their missions form themselves, as it were, into a common native Church?

We cannot but advert here to what was universally felt to be one of the most interesting and hopeful features of the Council—the two meetings which were addressed, the one by missionaries from many heathen countries, the other by representatives of the Continental Churches. Among the speakers at the first meeting were men of all varieties of colour—African, Red Indian, Hindoo, a French missionary from Basutoland, and English-speaking missionaries from Greece, Egypt, China, Japan, and New Hebrides. Among the Continental speakers there, and at another meeting, were labourers from France, Belgium, Italy, Bohemia, Moravia, and Spain. No happier or more telling speech was delivered at any session of the Alliance than that of the jet-black speaker from Liberia, whose eloquence, fervour, and most marked felicity in the use of the English language, showed what a negro could do, and gave one glorious hopes for the hundred and fifty millions of Africans whom he represented. No more hopeful view of the future of France was presented than that of our old friend M. Réveillaud, whose contribution to the first number of this journal will now be recalled with especial interest, and who seemed so hearty in the cause, and so well fitted, by God's help, to advance it. Such clusters of speeches reminded one how large and successful is the mission-work going on in the world under the Presbyterian Churches, and inspired one with new hope for the speedy arrival of a great harvest time.

The Council has taken another step towards increased efficiency. It has resolved to secure a larger share of the services of one who has shown a remarkable capacity for advancing its objects—the Rev. Dr. Mathews. Friends who accuse the Council of idleness ought to remember that, with trifling exceptions, the entire work hitherto done in connection with it has been done without money and without price. It has been the free-will labour of brethren who have had abundance of other burdens on their shoulders. But for permanent work we must have permanent men. We look for great benefit as the fruit of this determination of the Council, and we heartily congratulate it on getting one so eminently qualified to aid more systematically in its work.

The Catholic Presbyterian has abundant cause to be thankful for the kind words spoken on its behalf. It is not an organ of the Alliance, nor is it directly under its control. But it was begun as the result of deliberations held at the Edinburgh meeting, and it is conducted by men who have been most closely identified with the whole movement. What

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

was said of it both in public and in private is enough to put fresh heart and hope into any editor. No doubt, papers have appeared or have not appeared, and things have been said or have not been said, out of which both North and South might have gathered grounds of offence. It is the part of little natures to allow little errors or little wrongs to obliterate all sense of substantial usefulness. It is the part of generous natures not to allow the little errors or the little wrongs to abate the heartiness with which they express themselves when they are substantially satisfied. It is of this latter style of treatment that *The Catholic Presbyterian* has to make grateful acknowledgment. We are glad that the encomiums passed on it have embraced all departments alike—those of the publishers, printers, authors, and editors. We are particularly glad that the most popular and useful department of our journal is so commonly pronounced to be the "General Survey." It is eminently creditable to America to feel such interest in the distant parts of the world. We will only say further, that we trust the kind words of our friends will not end in smoke. The circulation of *The Catholic Presbyterian* is large and varied, but to make the journal what it ought to be, it would need to be just doubled. Every subscriber that finds another helps it greatly. And considering that the Council is not to meet again for four years, an organ is simply indispensable. If the Alliance had to sleep day and night for four years, and wake up for a few days in 1884, to go to sleep again immediately after for other four or five years, it would spend all its waking time rubbing its eyes and yawning. If *The Catholic Presbyterian* in any degree fulfils its purpose, it will keep the whole movement alive—it will exhibit the kind of men who met at Philadelphia standing shoulder to shoulder in another field—it will stimulate and in some degree satisfy that mutual interest which was so powerfully drawn out by the meetings of the Council, and prepare the way for that united action to which the Council looks forward as the great characteristic of its future history. We only wish that our brethren of all Churches would avail themselves more of the department which we have called "Open Council." If practical, and even theoretical, questions were ventilated there, frankly and briefly, great good might be done. It is a department in which brethren need not wait for a request from the Editor—anything of real importance that presses on a man's spirit he is welcome to express. It is indispensable that such letters should be short—the tendency to long-windedness here needs to be firmly repressed.

We cannot but express our sense of the Christian magnanimity of the great majority of the Council in restricting the psalmody to the Psalms of David, in order not to offend the convictions of the United Presbyterians of the United States, and a few other brethren. The respect of the Council for the scruples of a small minority was highly to its credit. At the same time, the minority will do well to consider that compliance with their wishes here was a great act of self-denial, and deprived the majority of the Council of what they would have deemed

a great privilege and a great joy. The same remark is applicable to the absence of the Communion from the meeting of the Council. To have come together on the Lord's day to sit round the table of love, would have been a means of great spiritual enjoyment, and most probably of high spiritual edification. Is it out of the question to look at Belfast for some arrangement, satisfactory to all parties, by which this privilege may be enjoyed?

We cannot conclude these cursory and hastily-written remarks without adverting very emphatically to the admirable exertions of the Philadelphia local committee. Men in high positions, and at the head of important business concerns, readily gave their whole time to the work of the Council, both before its meetings began, and while they were in progress. Seldom have we seen more complete devotedness than theirs. The hospitality, too, of the citizens was overflowing, and public bodies vied with one another to show attention. The daily press, giving ample reports from day to day, showed an admirable spirit, contrasting conspicuously with that of some newspapers on the other side on a former occasion, and laid the Council under great obligations.

The Belfast Committee will be able to learn lessons from Philadelphia. We have already adverted to the desirableness of a less crowded programme. We would add that a great improvement might be made in the matter of Chairmen. At the Edinburgh meeting, the plan of a Chairman for every session was fallen on, simply because no outstanding man could be found on whom all might unite as suitable for the office of Moderator. At Philadelphia, chairmen were chosen, not so much for efficiency, as for the reason that they had not been asked to prepare papers, but much inconvenience followed. A single Moderator, with a couple of deputies, accustomed to rule, would be able to grasp the whole proceedings, to preserve unity of administration, to keep in view in their prayers both the past and the future, to make the whole thing go on with a steady onward current. Evidently, too, there should be more use of the printing press. All reports should be printed beforehand. As in some of our General Assemblies, the proceedings of each day might be printed and put into the hands of members every morning, along with the programme for the day. The printing of proposed committees before they are finally agreed to, might also be of much benefit. We note these things while they are fresh in our memory—*valeant quantum*. The prestige of the last two meetings, as well as the energy of our Irish brethren, will secure a good meeting at Belfast. The permanent clerk will be able to arrange many things that have hitherto been left to haphazard. Altogether, this movement may now be regarded as one of the most important of the age. May the great Head of the Church who has graciously prospered it hitherto, carry it forward from Council to Council with ever-increasing usefulness and ever-growing success!

EDITOR.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN WALES.

PART II.

AMONG those preachers of the Calvinistic Methodists of last century who made up by ardent zeal and sound sense for their lack of education, perhaps no worthier name can be found than that of John Evans, of Bala—a man of penetrating mind and ready wit, tempered by a kind and conciliatory spirit. Intimately connected with the movements of his denomination for a period of seventy-three or seventy-four years,—almost from its very commencement,—he did not shrink during the earlier years from enduring persecution for the sake of the Gospel, and throughout life adorned the doctrine of God, his Saviour, with the beauty of a blameless Christian character. Familiar in childhood with the teaching of Scripture—he could read his Bible in Welsh and English at the age of nine or ten—he confesses that he was afterwards led, in company with other youths, to frequent the performance of certain empty plays, for which his conscience smote him with troubled dreams. Between the age of twelve and thirteen he was apprenticed to a weaver near Wrexham, and upon the expiry of his apprenticeship was seized with a desire to enlist as a soldier. He set off to Chester with this intention, but found that the company had left before his arrival. Returning home, he recommenced his old occupation, but afterwards, growing restless, sought employment in a mine in the district. From this neighbourhood he felt constrained to flee, on account of conscientious scruples about taking an oath in a court of justice, to which he had been cited as a witness, having a nervous dread of unwittingly perjuring himself in giving his evidence. Under the guidance of a higher hand he set off for Bala early on Sunday morning, and reached there on the evening of the same day. On the following morning he found employment in a Christian household, and, like the apostle, “because he was of the same craft he abode with them, and wrought.” This was the turning point of his life. In the house there assembled for worship a company of nine or ten Calvinists, to whom he felt himself drawn, and with whom he eventually joined in fellowship. In 1744 he married Margaret, daughter of Morris ap Rhobert, a man of some celebrity as a bard. He remained in the communion twenty years before he began to preach. His public testimony entailed bitter persecutions for the sake of the truth, and many times he had to flee from the place where he had gone to proclaim the message of salvation. A number of gentlemen, with the view of getting him out of the way, pressed him very hard to become a soldier. On one occasion he was obliged to leave his house and hide in a corn-field to escape the importunities of his tormentors. On another occasion he was struck by a stone in going down the street, whereby his lower

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1890.]

lip was cut through and one of his teeth broken, and from the effects of which he sank down in a fit. Years after, he met with his assailant in a state of great poverty, and provided him with a dinner.

In his preaching he aimed in the first place at enlightening the understanding. His ministrations, accordingly, were not at first so acceptable as those of others who sought specially to play upon the feelings. He studied simplicity in manner, language, and thought. It has been said of him that he knew not the fear of man, and held himself responsible to a higher than an earthly tribunal. The energy of the flesh had no place in his preaching. It was even asserted that there was no thunder in it, and that, consequently, he failed to kindle any lightning in his audience. Under this impression, a number of well-meaning brethren came to a formal resolution that it would be better if he gave up the work of preaching, and they deputed one of their number to convey to him this their decision. His answer was characteristic of the man: "Oh! I hear," he said to the messenger, "Go you back to —, and tell them that I will preach until I find somebody else beginning, that can preach better than myself."

A sound Calvinist, he was yet averse to the occupation of the mind with the Divine mysteries *to the exclusion of* questions of a more immediately practical nature. Once, when the election of grace was the subject under discussion, John Evans, who was a little deaf, asked what the brethren were speaking about. "On election," was the reply. "Are there," he again asked, somewhat slowly, "any in your midst doubting respecting the doctrine of election? If there are not, there are other things as necessary to treat upon, and other things to be proved and known." "John Evans," said Mr. Jones of Edyrn (a minister of note in the body), "I am a farmer. If you saw me in one field, that would not prove that I had no other fields." "True," was the rejoinder; "but if I saw you *continually* in the same one field, I should gather that you had no other field than that." In a society in South Wales, Evans complained that none of the South Wales preachers called to see some poor brethren at Graig Machynlleth, when on their way to North Wales on an evangelising tour, and entreated them not to forget "the little pastorless flock." Mr. Jones, of Langan (a well-known clergyman), rose and said, "None of the people there send to us to say, 'Come.''" "Well, Sir," said Evans, "have you forgotten that 'Go' has been said to you?"

An anecdote, with which some of our readers may be familiar, bears indications of belonging to the evening of his life. Once, when conversing with his wife, who was quite a theologian, she suddenly asked him, "John, shall we recognise each other in heaven?" "Well," he replied, "to be sure we shall. Do you think we shall be more foolish there than we are here?" Then, after a pause, he added, "But, Margaret, we might be near each other a thousand years without noticing one another, by reason of the glory and wonders of the person of the great Redeemer, which will occupy all our attention and thought."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

He died, after a painful illness, 12th August, 1817, having attained an age verging on 94 years. The tribute borne to him by his brethren in 1811 was fully merited, and a higher he could hardly desire to have. It was to this effect: "Mr. John Evans, of Bala, is a man mighty in the Scriptures, unchangeable, and established in the Christian religion. He has been a faithful witness for the truth, in doctrine and discipline, for about fifty-five years."

Of the Welsh poetry of this period, William Williams is the foremost representative. His father was the proprietor of the little estate of Pant-y-Celyn (Holly Vale), in Carmarthenshire, about two miles from which, at Cefncoed, in the parish of Llanfair-ar-y-Bryn, the poet was born in 1717. His parents were Christians of the old Puritan stamp. Their son was educated for the medical profession. In his twenty-first year, however, he heard Howell Harris preaching in Talgarth cemetery, and the sermon left a deep impression upon his mind, as he himself tells us in his elegy upon that celebrated preacher. Thenceforth he resolved to prosecute his studies for the work of the ministry. In 1740 he received ordination at the hands of the bishop of St. David's, but at the end of three years refused to take priest's orders. Nineteen charges were about this time brought against him on account of acts of ecclesiastical irregularity, such as preaching in unconsecrated places, &c., but among them not a single charge of immorality or unsound doctrine. The result was that he joined the fellowship of those who had already seceded from the Establishment for like reasons. He was at this time in the habit of going every month to Llangeitho, to assist Mr. Rowlands in the administration of the Lord's Supper to the thousands who came there. He married very happily in 1732, and went to live on his property at Pant-y-Celyn, now somewhat augmented. There, while farming his own land, he found time, for the space of about forty-five years, for travelling forty or fifty miles a-week on his preaching tours, as well as for composing verses which the Church of his fatherland will not willingly let die. Many interesting particulars respecting him are to be gleaned from a notice which Mr. Charles wrote of him at the time of his death. His first poetical compositions, under the title of "Alleluia," were very favourably received. These were followed by others in 1751, 1753, 1754. His "Sea of Glass" ("Songs of those that are upon the Sea of Glass, to the King of Saints"), appeared in 1762, and upon its reaching Llangeitho was the occasion of a great revival there. He published in English two volumes of hymns, "Hosanna to the Son of David" (1759), an "Elegy on the Rev. G. Whitefield" (1771), and "Gloria in Excelsis" (1772). He also made a Welsh translation of Mr. Erskine's treatise on the "Assurance of Faith," which translation was reprinted in 1760. He was gathered home in a good old age in 1791.*

A few years later, Ann Griffiths, born in Montgomeryshire a hundred

* Admirable translations of Welsh hymns by William Williams, Morgan Rhys (died about 1776), and others, have been made by the Rev. William Howells, of Trevecca.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

years ago (1776), was pouring forth her songs of joy upon the clear mountain heights of faith and love. She died in August 1805, before completing her twenty-ninth year. All that is preserved of her poetry was reduced to writing only some years after her death. To her case the words of the Son of Sirach apply: "The bee is little among them that fly; but her fruit is the chief among sweet things." With the mention of Ann Griffiths, the references to the preachers and poets of the eighteenth century may find an appropriate close.

The ministry of John Elias forms the connecting link between the patriarchs and fathers of the Calvinistic Methodists and their successors in the present day. This eminent man was little more than sixteen years of age at the time of Rowlands' death. After passing through a period of deep spiritual convictions, he was received into the fellowship at the age of eighteen. Two years and a half later (December, 1794) he rejoiced in being welcomed at the monthly meeting, and recognised as one called to the ministry of the Word. In 1799 he removed from Carnarvonshire to Anglesey, where his home was to be for the remainder of his life. For the space of forty-six years, he laboured in word and doctrine in various parts of Wales with extraordinary success. His death took place 8th June, 1841, shortly after he had attained his sixty-seventh year. It was his privilege not only to spread the truth very widely in North Wales, but also to produce a great moral reformation in the inhabitants of Anglesey, to establish many Sunday schools, and greatly to multiply the means of grace. The earnestness with which he contended against the declension from the earlier fervour of the Church was never more strikingly exhibited than at the Pwllheli Association of 1832. He took his text on that occasion from Ps. lxxviii. 1, and so greatly was the power of the Divine presence felt, that many of the audience fell to the ground crying for mercy, and, according to a probable estimate, *no fewer than 2500 persons* were added to the Church in Carnarvonshire as a result of the impression left by that one sermon. The deep humility of his spirit is attested by the last entry ever made in his diary: "To God belongeth the glory—I am and was nothing. This shall be seen in the day when He reveals all secrets. If the Lord made use of me as an instrument in His hands to bring some sinner or sinners to Christ, that is an unspeakable privilege; and it will be a cause of joy in the day of Christ, that I ran not in vain, neither laboured in vain."

From the death of Mr. Charles in 1814, the advocacy of the Bible Society in North Wales had devolved mainly upon Mr. Elias, and nobly did he sustain its claims. Much also was done by him in the way of promoting the cause of total abstinence in his native land. The cause of foreign missions was always near to his heart, and he lived to see the beginning of a work in Brittany and among the Cassia hills in India directly undertaken by his own church (1840). Bala College, for the training of young men to the work of the ministry, was likewise estab-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

lished during his lifetime, and placed under the presidency of the present Dr. Edwards, a student and friend of the renowned Thomas Chalmers. Somewhat later, an additional college was opened at Trevecca, in place of that of the Countess of Huntingdon, which had been removed to Cheshunt after her death in 1791. Of this college, the late Rev. T. Charles (afterwards Dr. Charles), grandson to Mr. Charles of Bala, was appointed the first principal. The last event of peculiar interest since the death of John Elias was the formation of the General Assembly in 1864,* whereby the copestone was placed upon the Presbyterian edifice, slowly and gradually rising towards completion since the year 1736. It was not formed a moment too early. The closing years of the present century are perhaps destined to test the homogeneity of the body to a greater extent than ever before.

In order to make a forecast with regard to the future of Calvinistic Methodism, it is necessary previously to take a retrospective glance. During the first seventy-five years of the existence of this denomination, the work of evangelisation was accomplished partly by ministers who were still in the Established Church, such as Mr. Griffiths, vicar of Nevern,—partly by those who had formerly been so, and partly by unordained preachers. The congregations, gathered in various places, held their private devotional and experience meetings under the guidance of elders chosen from among themselves, the monthly meetings and quarterly associations exercising a general oversight over the whole. Even after the ordination of ministers within the body itself (1811), no fixed charges were, as a rule, assigned to them: they were expected to exercise their ministry in any congregation where this might be required. Such an arrangement arose out of the exigencies of the times, when it would have been impossible and undesirable to appoint a pastor to each congregation. The gifts of each existed for all, and the ministrations of the several preachers were seldom confined for more than a few days to one place. Only in this way could the Word of the Gospel be carried throughout the whole Principality. Men of Apostolic fervour and simplicity, in many cases braving Apostolic hardships, went forth, impelled by the love of Christ, and guided by the precept: "Freely ye have received, freely give." And among the faithful heralds of the cross there are perhaps few whose labours have been more signally blessed than those of these humble evangelists. Thrifty farmers, possessed of a small patrimony, or otherwise sustaining themselves by the toil of their own hands, they may be truly spoken of as "poor, yet making many rich." Few names will shine with brighter lustre in the heraldry of heaven than those of some of these men, so entirely overlooked on earth. Their names will live in the hearts of hundreds and thousands brought to salvation through their ministry, though the very language in which their winged words and burning prayers were uttered should perish from

* The late Dr. Henry Rees was chosen to be the first Moderator of the Assembly, as Daniel Rowlands was of the Association.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

their native land. Their abiding record is on high, though the simple, God-fearing generation which grew up under the sound of their voice shall disappear from the earth. And even now the Church has need to recall from oblivion the deeds of men to whom God was nearer than the world, and eternity a more present reality than time.

Such an itinerant ministry, however, could hardly make good the lack of a settled pastorate. It is greatly to be regretted, therefore, that provision was not made, from the beginning, for a transition which must sooner or later become desirable, and even inevitable. From the neglect to make such a provision, there may hereafter arise the greatest danger to the continued efficiency of the Church which has yet appeared within the Calvinistic Methodist body.

If I endeavour to point out where the strain is likely to be soonest felt, I do so in sincere affection for a communion of Christians whom I have always loved, and many of whose ministers and members are among the brightest ornaments of the Church of God. Because I am persuaded that a thoroughly Presbyterian organisation, animated by that spirit of life still so mightily present in the great gatherings of the Calvinistic Methodists, would be an inestimable blessing to this land of Wales, I may be allowed to indicate one or two weak points in actual practice. In doing so, I confine my remarks to the case of the English-speaking congregations, among whom the earlier discipline of the Connection is to a certain extent relaxed, and consequently the peril of sectarianism is greatest.* The majority of these congregations have now pastors, though some have existed at different periods for a considerable time without pastoral oversight. If they have suffered during the interval, it has been mainly from the want of sufficiently explicit rules as to the qualifications required in those who, from time to time, have been called to occupy the vacant pulpit. Some of the brethren, indeed, who have made these appointments, would seem to think that the highest qualification consisted in the preachers being strangers to the communion in which they were to minister. The practice in this respect might with advantage be assimilated in a much greater degree to that of the other Presbyterian bodies, rather than that an appointment which so intimately affects the spiritual welfare of the congregation should be left absolutely to the discretion of a single person.

In cases where there are pastors, it would appear a necessity that the pastor should use his own judgment, in accord with that of the elders, as to the filling up of the pulpit for those Sundays—in some cases amounting to a full half of the whole year—on which he does not preach at home. Yet this is not a rule universally observed. The neglect of such a simple principle, however, can only be followed by the serious diminution of the spiritual influence of the ministry, and a proportionate

* The word *sectarianism* is here employed in the sense attached to it by Bengel on 1 Cor. xi. 19, as “a defection of one part from the unity of the Church, either in faith or worship.” (Compare his note on Acts xxiv. 14.)

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

laxity in the discipline of the congregation. In the interests, therefore, of the congregation itself, the evil calls for the attention of the General Assembly, before it has assumed proportions subversive of all order. Its effect has already been to exclude more than one of the abler Welsh preachers from ministering at all in the English congregations, and to induce a want of cohesion among the members of the body, which the influence of the Presbytery—indisputably good as it is—has not been able entirely to counterbalance. It is not too much to say that this is the *questio permanentis aut prætereuntis ecclesiæ*.

The dangers just mentioned arise from the non-application of the Presbyterian principle. A third, which probably in equal measure threatens all Christian communities, arises from the lowered standard of the spiritual life. When the world comes into the Church, the influence of the ministry is of necessity paralysed. The preaching tends to adapt itself to the tastes and wishes of an audience which has no appreciation of the truths of salvation. False doctrines find a congenial soil in the hearts of unregenerate men. A stumbling-block is placed in the way of the young, and true members of Jesus Christ are repelled by the worldliness of professing Christians. The root of the evil is generally to be found in the want of sufficient care in the examination of candidates; the gate of admission is made wider than Christ Himself has made it. On this point I am tempted to cite the judicious words of an anonymous American writer: "The Presbyterian Church possesses a glorious heritage in her Confession, Catechisms, and history. She has the truth and the form. What she needs is to embody this truth in living witnesses, 'a peculiar people.' Charity to her Master, herself, and the world, demand that she should carefully guard her ordinances and name. It may at least be questioned whether her *practice* is not at times too loose. Regeneration is a great thing, and works great changes in the heart and life wherever it is experienced. Our Church's doctrine requires regeneration before admission. Do we in practice wait, and require to see the fruits of this change? And how can a session best determine when it has been wrought?"

The immediate want of North Wales is most of all an English Presbytery, which could deal more efficiently with the questions affecting the English congregations than can be done by the Welsh Presbytery. One good effect of its formation would be greatly to strengthen the bond of union between the English and Welsh-speaking congregations. It would at the same time be well that some, at least, of the proceedings of the Synod and General Assembly should be published in English, as a means of deepening the interest of the English congregations in the movements of the body. The recommendation of a Catechism for use throughout the whole Church would in like manner tend to knit more closely together the different sections. The attention of the members might also with advantage be directed to the abundant Presbyterian literature published in the English language; and, in the future, an organ akin to the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

American "Central Presbyterian" might perhaps be contemplated. Such an organ would prove of great value for thoughtful young men, as a vindication, at once scientific and popular, of those immutable truths upon which the spiritual life of the individual and of the Church is to be built up.

The feeling in favour of closer relations with other Churches of the Presbyterian order is, I believe, a deep and growing one on the part of those best entitled to represent the interests of the Calvinistic Methodist Church. The task imposed upon this Church has become much more arduous than before, owing to the transformation brought about by the rapid spread of the English language within the Principality during the last few years; and it can hardly hope, in a state of isolation, to retain the place of pre-eminence it has held for a hundred years past. This, indeed, would be of little importance in itself, if other communities were likely to do as much for the evangelisation of Wales in the future as Calvinistic Methodism has done in the past. But a Church which, without entering into competition with other denominations, has been content to uphold the banner of sound doctrine and spiritual order, bending its whole energies to the work of saving the lost, is now less than ever to be spared. For the accomplishment of the Church's mission in Wales, moreover, the Presbyterian order—as not sacrificing the Church's rights to the supposed claims of the congregation, nor the rights of the congregation to the supposed claims of the Church—has proved itself to be best adapted. Under present circumstances, nothing perhaps could have a better effect in the way of strengthening the hands of the ministry in Wales, and promoting a friendly feeling between the Presbyterian Church in this country and those Churches beyond the borders, than a greater measure of interchange between the ministers of the sister Churches. The Welsh congregations might, on their part, find much to learn from some of the preachers of England or Scotland; and the English congregations would listen with interest to the more gifted of the Welsh brethren. There is certainly a charm and freshness about the ministrations of the best Welsh preachers which I do not remember to have heard surpassed elsewhere. In the meantime, hardly a greater kindness can be done to the young English congregations than by a Sunday devoted to them, from time to time in the summer, on the part of some of those honoured and eloquent brethren "whose praise is in all the churches." To mention only a single instance, the services rendered in this way by the Rev. Dr. Hoge, of Richmond, Virginia, on the occasion of his recent friendly visit, have not only been warmly appreciated, but have also, in the experience of many, left impressions for eternity.*

In conclusion, I would plead for a yet greater measure of fraternal sympathy, on the part of brethren in other lands, with the Presby-

* It ought also to be added, that the Rev. Dr. Davidson, of London, has for some years taken an interest in the progress of the English congregations in Wales.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1889.]

terian Church in Wales, in its endeavour to provide Presbyterian ministrations for those of its children who, year by year, go to swell the ranks of the English-speaking population of the country. In face of the growing anti-Christianism of the age, the testimony of the Church, as a Church, in accordance with Scripture and the standards of the Reformation, is more and more loudly called for. It is true that the form of the outward Church is to be regarded only as a means to an end; moreover, the most admirable organisation is ineffectual for good, unless accompanied by the power of the Spirit on the hearts and lives of the members, and the most perfect Church on earth is still marked by many imperfections. Nevertheless, the Presbyterian Church, if it is faithful to its vocation, is evidently in a position for accomplishing a glorious work in the world. May it, in Wales too, manifest in an increasing degree the character of a pure, a spiritual, and an unworldly Church; and thus contribute to prepare the way for the advent of that perfected Church, in which there shall be "one flock, one Shepherd."

MAURICE J. EVANS.

THE MISSION OF THE PEACEMAKER IN MODERN THOUGHT.

THE peacemaker has not been an altogether unknown character in the world of letters and among theologians. Even Athanasius could bid angry ecclesiastics not dispute about words. An early Roman Pope wrote to the first missionary to our Saxon ancestors not to insist upon mere difference of ritual. Erasmus sought to make a Humanistic truce between the Papacy and the rising wrath of the Reformation. Melancthon's gentler spirit tempered Luther's zeal. Amid the strife of the Protestant Confessions, mediating voices were sometimes heard. In England, the Cambridge Platonists dreamed of a higher reconciliation of reason and faith; while, at the beginning of our own century, Schleiermacher sought to win rationalism back to faith by his discourses upon religion addressed to its despisers among the educated.

The mission of the peacemaker in the world of thought has sometimes, doubtless, been unworthily undertaken, and has often failed of its reward. The Church has its ages of conflict, and the great defenders of its faith. No man of sound historic sense will deny that there is still a tremendous battle to be fought out between a materialistic civilisation and a spiritual faith, between the Babylon which enslaves the souls of men and the Jerusalem above which is free. We would not under-estimate the greatness of present conflicts of Christianity; but there are not a few signs of the times which seem to indicate that there is a providential call for the peacemaker, and a blessed work of reconciliation to be accomplished amid

the confusions of modern thought. We shall point out some of these providential signs in different quarters, and then inquire who is worthy of this mission, and what he may seek to accomplish among us.

One encouraging sign of the coming of the peacemaker is to be observed in the present more friendly and hopeful relation of our leading sciences to our chief faiths. One indication that the quiet work of the husbandman in modern thought may not be far off, is the present attitude of many scientific men to religious questions. The modern explorers, indeed, in new fields of knowledge had hardly begun to come back from their investigations, before the philosopher appeared with his word of the reconciliation of all knowledge in one grand generalisation. But Herbert Spencer came too soon to be the peacemaker of modern thought. His attempted truce between religion and science proved the signal for new contentions. The human mind cannot rest contented with a treaty of non-intervention between reason and faith. The human heart cannot long be satisfied with Nihilism in religion. Compromise is never peace. The proud resignation of knowledge is not the last word of a reason organised for God. The utterances of eminent students of nature might be quoted to show that the spirit which is in man is not ready in this nineteenth century to make its last will and testament, and thought is not about to commit suicide in materialism. For example, the late Professor Clerk Maxwell, whose life brought a positive addition to human knowledge, is reported to have said that he had scrutinised all the agnostic theories he knew of, and found that they, one and all, needed a God to make them workable.

But more important, and more significant, than the utterances of individual scientists, is the augury which we may draw from the apparent direction or line of advance of several sciences. Which way, we ask, is the current running? For a time it seemed as if the whole drift of modern thought were away from faith; but the line of progress of the chief sciences, we venture to affirm, as measured by the latest indications, is in a direction which will not bear us ultimately away from our spiritual faiths. No science, for example, began its career with a more threatening aspect than the science, as it may now be called, of mental physiology. It was to lay bare, in the cells of the brain, the secret dwelling-place of memory. — Like the audacious Roman general, it was to lift the veil from the mysterious holy-place of the temple of the body, and to find no image of divinity within. But this scientific inspection of the brain has now been carried on a sufficient length of time, not indeed for us to read its final results, but to judge confidently, at least, of its tendency and probable conclusion. It is still an unfinished science, with not a few problems of extreme difficulty before it; but it has already gone far enough for us to tell in what direction lies its true line of advance, and this is not towards materialism. Nerve-arcs and molecular changes are not found sufficient to enable us to dispense as yet with volition, and the directing touch of some unseen power. The line of progress of this study is obviously away from the crude material-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

ism of some of its earlier advocates. A little beyond Vogt and Büchner stands Dr. Maudsley, who is somewhat less gross in his materialism than they ; still further down the course of this rapidly advancing science we meet Bain with his qualified materialism ; and a step beyond him, Lewes with his, if anything, still more guarded statements, and his rejection of the notion that man is a machine ; still further along is Wundt, who is altogether beyond the earlier materialism of his science ; and furthest advanced of all is that cautious yet bold philosopher, Hermann Lotze, who finds that all physical science, when followed perseveringly out to the end, runs into that deep and pure spiritual philosophy which has ever flowed through the history of human thought as the river of life from God. The tendency, we say—the line of progress—of this science of mental philosophy is not from Lotze down to Büchner, but plainly it is all the other way. Professor Calderwood's recent volume marks, not an out-grown or retrogressive stage of mental science, but some of its latest and best-reasoned positions.

A complete physiology of the brain, were we able to form it, might be the perfect demonstration of the soul. Doubt would seem to be but imperfect knowledge, as faith is harmonised thought.

Similarly, the line of advance of Darwinism is in a hopeful direction. There is, it is true, an atheistic line of descent from Darwinism. But even in a purely scientific environment, does any atheistic variation of Darwinism fit it better to survive ? On the contrary, the natural selection of different varieties of the theory of evolution would seem to favour the more pronounced theistic types of it. Any variation towards theism proves a help rather than a hindrance in the struggle of Darwinism for existence in the general environment of modern thought. While Darwinism has undoubtedly entered in some measure into our best schools, modifying the views even of so conservative a teacher as Professor Dana, it cannot be said that Hæckelism, or the atheistic variation of Darwinism, is gaining the ascendancy. The positions, rather, so clearly defined by our own eminent Professor Gray, mark the really progressive tendency of this mode of thought ; and certainly, so long as it looks in that direction, it will not leave out of sight the old argument from purpose and design in nature.

Another sign pointing in the same direction is the progress of the naturalistic science of history. The more thoroughly it is worked out, the more completely does it prove its own insufficiency ; the real line of advance of historical science leads towards the conception of a supernatural development of history. As the naturalistic key to the secrets of life and history is tried over and over again in expert hands, it becomes more and more apparent that there are human experiences which it will not open, and whole passages of history which it cannot unlock. So long as all imaginable combinations of mechanical forces have not been tried in the solution of life and history ; so long as all possible theories of the earthly origin of revelation, and the spontaneous

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

generation of the life of Christianity from the dead Roman world, have not been fabricated and tested, historical scepticism may still find room for doubt; but the final demonstration of any merely naturalistic philosophy of history is its thorough trial as an explanation of the positive facts of human experience. Thus, the earlier mythical theory of Strauss only needed time to work itself out to be abandoned. Baur's "tendency-theory," which superseded it, only needed to be thoroughly applied as an explanation of Christian history to be proved in its turn insufficient. There are wards in the lock which that key cannot pass. Another historical key than either the original one of Strauss, or the more ingenious one of Baur, must be tried by rationalism. And it has now fashioned a new theory—a kind of skeleton-key for all contingencies, not cumbrous and solid, but light and flexible—which is expected, in the hands of modern historical experts like Kuenen and the authors of the "Bible for Learners," by skilful manipulation, to be found equal to the task of opening easy access through the grand passages of prophecy, and into the holy mystery of redemption. All we need ask is, that every historical key which naturalism can fabricate shall be thoroughly tried upon the known facts. For one theory of unbelief after another, from Celsus to Baur, has failed to solve the providential combinations of events in history. The word spoken by the same Lord who arranged these combinations of events in their Christian prophecy and fulfilment, is alone able to yield their adequate interpretation, to give a satisfactory working theory of history. The monkish biographer of St. Patrick, not knowing how his Saint reached Ireland, yet not content to be without an explanation so long as he could evolve one from his own brain, and rely on the credulity of his readers for its acceptance, soberly relates that St. Patrick swam the Irish Channel, carrying his head in his teeth. A similar tax upon our credulity is made by naturalistic explanations of the progress of human history. If we will not believe in the Divine power by which the good has been pressed forward in history, if we do not admit a Divine evolution of human history, we have no recourse left but to invent some theory as ingenious as the monk's happy idea of his patron saint carrying his head in his teeth.

Another sign of coming peace between modern knowledge and modern faith may now be discerned, and it is a sign of no little significance. We refer to the fact that the latest and largest generalisations of positive science are decidedly idealistic, not to say transcendental, in their appearance, and at heart are not far from the kingdom of God. For example, do not recent theories regarding the nature of matter wear a decidedly spiritualistic expression? What is matter? "A phenomenon," "a mode of force," "a form of motion," "a perfect fluid," "rotating circuits in a primitive liquid" which is "incapable of appealing to our senses." The process of thought about matter sweeps away from the visible, and enters the sphere of the unseen and the intangible. The physicist some-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

times seems now-a-days to have become the veriest transcendentalist—the positivist turns idealist. From the direction of thought, so far as it has penetrated into the hidden nature of matter, we might prophesy that if we ever could reach its last secret, we should come out into the realm of Will, and stand worshipping before the creation-idea of the Eternal.

But can we speak so hopefully concerning those great generalisations which are peculiarly the triumphs of modern science, such as the principle of continuity, the law of the conservation of energy, or that still more comprehensive formula for the unity of things,—evolution? The words sound suspicious to Christian ears. The first appearance of some of these new phases of old ideas was not reassuring. Lessing, in one of his "Fables for the Times," relates the story of some children who were frightened by the appearance of a threatening countenance in their midst, until at length one of them, bolder than the rest, looked the apparition in the eye, and discovered behind the mask a familiar face. It may be that all we need to do is to look new phases of thought boldly in the eye to discover, beneath their threatening aspects, real friends of our childhood's faith. We do not pretend, indeed, that there is anything friendly or hopeful in the modern superstition of nature. For the great superstition of modern thought is nature. The essence of idolatry is worship of the creature, and the very intellectuality and refinement of the modern superstition of nature constitute its most deceptive and enslaving attraction. But if it be idolatry to bow before an image of wood or stone, it is superstition—more subtle, but perhaps, therefore, all the more mischievous superstition—to make an image of an idea, an idol of a thought, and to regard nature as though it were an entity having existence in itself,—without beginning of days, an endless product of its own ceaseless forces. Under the shadow of this modern paganism, poetry cannot blossom, hope grows pale, and life loses its worth. In this conception, the universe is a cast-iron piece of mechanical necessity, which shall crush out the fine life of the spirit as relentlessly as ever the Iron Virgin pressed the life-blood out of the martyr to liberty. It is hardly a hundred years since that instrument of torture, now exhibited at Nuremberg, closed its heavy iron folds upon its last victim; and possibly it may not be a hundred years hence before this cruel monistic philosophy of nature, which would smother within its iron necessities the human soul, and even crush the life of the Spirit of God Himself out of His universe, may be exhibited as a relic of the strange superstitions of the human intellect. If, however, we look this modern doctrine of evolution boldly in the eye, we may discover in it only a mask for the old friendly truth of the eternal purpose of God. The doctrine, especially, which Professor Gray calls a new article of the scientific creed—the unity of the creation—is a new presentation of the old truth which inspired Moses, "The Lord our God is one Lord."

From the top of Mount Katardhin, which rises a solitary peak in the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

wilderness of northern Maine, one may see, set in the midst of the green forests, numerous lakes glistening like pearls. On the far horizon, under the slant rays of the setting sun, lake after lake shines like a shield of burnished gold. At the mountain's foot, a pond of pure water clings like a dew-drop to the forest's edge. Wherever the eye turns, through many an opening in the tree-tops, may be seen some crystal mirror of water, reflecting the overhanging pines and the passing clouds. Occasionally, a silvery thread appears connecting adjacent lakes ; but the landscape as a whole lies spread beneath like a robe of green, over which there seems to have been scattered, by a prodigal hand, a thousand pearls. No system, and but little connection of lake with lake can be distinguished. But descend from the mountain, and for many a week you may follow from lake to lake, and through stream after stream, one great system of waters, which, from the mountains and the clouds above, flow together at last into the ocean, whose distant line of blue can be just seen from Katardhin's summit.

Now, the very fact that those almost numberless lakes are not single, isolated pools of water, scattered at haphazard over the landscape, but that their connecting stream may be traced, shows that they form one great watercourse, and must have been produced by similar geological forces. They belong to one formation, and did not come by mere chance, but by the operation of similar causes, under one general necessity of formation. The system precludes chance. The connection shows that nature was working out one tendency through them all ; that, through countless turns and past a thousand difficulties, nature was pushing one stream on to the sea. So, of old, Moses stood upon the mount of vision, and believed that the Lord is one God, and that all things created are the parts of the one Creator's grand design, though no patient science had traced out for him the unbroken continuity of nature, and determined by experiment the unity of the creation. What have our natural sciences been doing, but the preparatory work for the theologian's broader and final generalisation ? They have been filling up the apparent breaks between phenomena ; they have been threading the streams which connect the many lakes ; they have been discovering connection and system, method and order, where before we knew only of division and isolation. Thus, by the proofs of the unity of nature, they have been preparing anew the way for that one final and only comprehensive generalisation from the creation—God. We, Christian theists, are the very last persons to take alarm when the students of nature come back from any of their explorations with tidings that they have found the way which God's creative purpose has taken from age to age—from clouds of whirling atoms to well-ordered worlds—from structureless beginnings of life to the perfection of organisation in the brain of man. They are only showing, unwittingly it may be, how the one tendency, the one stream of Divine purpose has made its way on through the ages ; how God's good intention crosses every separation,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

and the strong fibres of His infrustrable design run beneath all and through all. So, then, we would prophesy that the latest generalisations of science, spiritually interpreted as they may be and should be, are signs, not of fresh alarms, but of peace for faith. We hail it as an omen of a better day, that already, in more than one earnest thinker's mind, the positive philosophy has, as it were, been caught up and transfigured into a spiritual faith.

But, if we turn to the opposite quarter, are the signs in the theological skies auspicious for the work of the peacemaker? Is it still true that in any of the leading denominations the iconoclast soon finds himself in difficulty? Like begets like, and the spirit of a self-confident and narrow liberalism naturally produces in any community a spirit of blind and obstinate dogmatism. If the theological student, fresh from the discussions of the Seminary, begins his ministry with the sword, he may expect to perish by the sword. He to whose careful hand the vine might gracefully yield its branches to be pruned, must not be surprised at tough resistance if he pulls at its very roots. But it is not too much to say that in all the great progressive denominations the signs to-day are auspicious for any really peaceable, scholarly, constructive work. The Christian scholar engaged on a genuine mission of reconstruction and peace will have little now-a-days to fear from Confessionalism. His methods will be closely scanned; his results may be subjected to careful review; but his mission will be honoured, and his work, if really scholarly and helpful, may hope for friendly recognition, even from the seats of conservatism.

Having thus pointed out certain signs in opposite quarters for the mission of the peacemaker in modern thought, we are now prepared to consider some of the qualifications needed for this work. Among the profound thoughts of Pascal occurs the saying, "In Christ, all contradictions are reconcilable." The peacemaker of modern thought can ever be no other than the Christian scholar. John's Gospel of the love of God in the Christ of His beholding, is, we believe, the true Eirenicon of modern thought. No one can hope to fulfil the blessed mission of the peacemaker among the discords of men's thoughts to-day who has not first heard, in his own heart of hearts, and so heard that he may recognise it ever and again through life's mocking echoes, that one deep voice of love, the key-note and harmony of the whole creation's changing speech, the life and element of all God's words and works.

"The man that could surround the sum of things, and spy
The heart of God, and secrets of His empire,
Would speak but love. With love, the bright result
Would change the hue of intermediate things,
And make one thing of all theology."

Without something of the Moravian poet's song of love in his heart, the music of his thoughts, the theologian, with all his zeal for truth,

can add but another contention to the distractions of human life. After the student has wrought out his theology by patient thought, much will depend upon the *colour* of it—whether love gives its bright hues to all intermediate things. Men may hold precisely the same dogmas, yet the colour of their theology be different—sombre and repulsive, or attractive, and as the beauty of the Lord. Whoever would do happy, harmonising work, must take his theology out into the light of the love of God, and let the hues of that revelation of God's glory play in and out through every thread and fold of it. Even the Gospel held in the shadow of a chilling, unethical conception of God, becomes another Gospel.

In the year 1850, Neander, in a review of the finished half-century, wrote these significant words concerning the virtue needed in the half-century to come:—"Of the cardinal virtues which should serve love, above all there is need of manliness and wisdom." Besides this supreme sense of the revelation, "God is love," and growing directly out of it, the peacemaker in modern thought must have the virtue of a manly, positive faith. The lack of downright manliness of faith is the reason why much so-called liberalism fails to win the peacemaker's blessing. As the art and rhetoric of the vacillating Cicero could not make peace among the factions of Rome, so nothing but the nerve of positive purpose and the vigour of sinewy faith can hope to bring order out of the confusions of the present. Even Cæsarism in thought may accomplish more in bringing vexed questions to a settlement than can a pleasing and purposeless liberalism; yet neither Cæsarism nor indifferentism can answer the real need of the hour, either in politics or in theology. Nerve and positivism of conviction must characterise the scholar who is to do useful work of reconstruction; but he must also possess his faith in that large teachable wisdom which, Neander saw, was one of the cardinal virtues for the times. The Christian peacemaker, in the humility of true wisdom, should be able to put himself into the minds of others, "to dwell enlarged in alien modes of thought." He must seek for that too rare grace of the sympathetic imagination, without which he cannot enter into the life of other minds. Through mental suffering, if need be, he must gain the power of vicarious thought, bearing in his own mental conflicts the burdens and even the sins of other minds.

Manliness and wisdom, born of love, will lead him to another essential virtue of the peacemaker. He will possess a certain historical largeness and catholicity of faith. Looking towards the future, and pressing forward, he will preserve a unity of spirit with the past, and will not readily or rashly fall out of the line of the great providential development of faith. He will recognise the difference between orthodoxism and orthodoxy. He who rushes headlong and headstrong into orthodoxism, chooses, not the peacemaker's blessing, but the part of a Nimrod in theology—a mighty hunter before the Lord, the beginning

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

of whose kingdom was Babel. But while there is an orthodoxy, unlovely and unhappy, to be avoided, there is an orthodoxy to be cherished and loved, especially by him who would do a good work of reconstruction in our day. It is the orthodoxy, not of yesterday, nor of to-day—an orthodoxy, not of people, or any Confession which any man or council of men have made or can make, but whose life is from the Spirit of truth who takes of the things of Christ and shows them from age to age,—an orthodoxy which is not dead, but, like the trees of the Lord, full of sap, the growth of the centuries, which still puts forth its leaf fresh every season. The historian who would bring forth, in his thinking, fruit which shall remain, must abide as the branch in the vine in this great historical development of truth. That man can hardly speak the needed word for the present, still less be a prophet for the Church of the future, whose life-pulses are never stirred by this conception of the historic work of the Spirit of truth in the one continuous faith of the ages,—who cannot feel, like the great Apostle, that his are the fathers, even while pressing forward to those things which are before, and following the Christ who walks ever in advance of His Church.

What position, then, should the Christian scholar who hears in his heart the blessed call of the peacemaker, hold to the established denominations and other creeds? Must he come out from all existing sects in order to fulfil his high calling? Can he keep his catholicity of spirit, his broad historical sympathies, yet conscientiously do his work within any existing denominational limits? This is no light question to be lightly answered; it weighs like a burden oftentimes upon many honourable consciences. But many valid reasons might be urged why the Christian thinker of evangelical spirit and of broad sympathies should not make haste to leave the home of his father's faith and the Church in whose communion he has been trained. He owes a duty to his own religious home. His own faith, by its very charity, will lead him, so long as he can, to live peaceably with his brethren, and to labour for the improvement of the old home. He also owes to the outside world a duty which he can best perform if he is able to do his work upon an established foundation.

For it is particularly difficult to preserve the spirit of the peacemaker if one allows himself to be driven unnecessarily into theological isolation. It is well-nigh impossible, moreover, to build any permanent work except upon historical ground. The tree whose roots are thrown up into the air soon finds its leaf withering. The roots of lasting fruitfulness strike down into the soil which the centuries have made. So the best theological growth is the quiet transformation of the past into the freshness and fruitfulness of present life. The true reformers have sought first to do their work within their country or Church, and for it, not against it. The most independent men are not those who in their youth take their portion of goods and go to a far country; the spirit of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

separation is apt to end its career among the husks. The Reformers were not schismatics. For these and similar reasons, quiet, peaceable work upon the established ground of the historic communions will seem greatly to be preferred by the Christian scholar, who, like the Scottish divine, Dr. John Duncan, can thus describe the order of his faith:—"I am first a Christian, next a Catholic, then a Calvinist, fourthly, a Pædo-Baptist, and fifthly, a Presbyterian." He will suffer no man to warn him off the ancestral ground so long as he treads it in conscious sympathy with the historic spirit, true progress, and future goal, of the Church in which he has his birthright. It would be an evil day for our great denominations, and a sad hour for our common Christianity, if any clamour of intolerance should so far prevail that those thinkers and professors, who feel in their own conscience that they are sent not to destroy but to fulfil the real genius and mission of their churches, should be driven into opposition to their brethren. Theirs is the example, at least, of the Master who began to preach the Gospel of the kingdom within the synagogues of His own people. It was right, unquestionably right for Jesus to do His greater work upon the ground prepared for Him by the old dispensation,—to be known as a Hebrew prophet, and to observe the Jewish law, though all the while He was ushering in a Gospel in which the old should, in fulfilment, pass away. His example was followed by the chosen Apostle to the Gentiles, who was the truly orthodox Jew, obeying the spirit of the law and following the providential development of the faith of Israel, though He was the first Christian to be called a heretic, and the narrow orthodoxism of the Jewish-Christian Church utterly misunderstood and opposed Him. Conscientiously and manfully, therefore, should Christian scholars whose hearts are loyal to the spirit of the faith which has been embodied in the successive historic creeds, stay at their posts of duty within the Churches which they love and would serve with their freest, latest, and best thoughts.

A few words are all that our space allows us to add with regard to the work which they who hear this call, and have their qualifications of the peacemaker, can begin to accomplish at once. Turning hopelessly from the sceptic, the heart of our age finds no help from the dogmatist, but he may hope to catch the ear of many who are weary of their doubt, and to minister to an age already becoming sick at heart of its denials. The culture of the present day needs the return of a clear, sunny faith. We may enter into its unbelief and overcome its evil by the good of a higher faith; but as we would succeed in that mission of true reconciliation, we must have nothing to do with any of those makeshifts and artifices of belief, those easy methods of spiritual demonstration, and pious frauds of interpretation, by which a Protestant infallibility would establish itself upon the ignorance of believers. To do this work of reconciliation, the Protestant Church must be pre-eminently a teaching Church, counting no knowledge foreign or hostile to it, and holding up Christ before all the sciences as the King of truth.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

And there is a greater work of peace in which alone these ages of the Reformation can find their goal. Mr. Gladstone has pronounced the reform of Catholicism and the unity of the Church to be the ruling ideas of this epoch. There are now, however, more sects in the Christian world than there were disciples who first met in an upper room to break bread together in the name of the risen Lord. These ages of the Reformation in which we have still our part, are necessarily, it would seem, ages of divisions; but in the Divine order of history, the era of separations and of private interpretations may be a necessary preparation, but certainly is not the final goal, of Christianity. Already the age of Romanism has culminated in the dogma of Infallibility, and is henceforth a broken and receding, though still foaming and mighty, wave; already the age of Protestantism has passed its necessary period of Confessionalism, is uniting rather than dividing still farther its several streams, and with increasing breadth is hastening on towards the peace in which its course shall close. In God's great order of history, first came Jesus, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of heaven; after His word came primitive Christianity, full of unsolved problems; after primitive Christianity came Romanism, with its attempt to show forth Christ in the external unity of the Church; after Romanism came Protestantism, the age of the Christ manifested in the individual conscience; and after Romanism and Protestantism,—what? What but the age of Christ in the unity of the Spirit—the age when He who gave to human history the truth of His life to work out, shall come again to behold His finished work, and to give up His kingdom to the Father? Is it a too distant vision, a glory of the far evening sky? But its glow may be upon our faces, and its hope a joy in our hearts as we pursue the humble tasks of our ministry. Whoever has lifted his eyes to its light will cherish henceforth large ideas of the aim of the Church. His very denominationalism will be transfigured into Catholicism by the radiance of this hope.

This work of the peacemaker is not an easy work to be lightly undertaken. In it there will be fears within and fightings without. Inward struggles, outward oppositions, and perhaps the suspicions of friends, enter into the cost of this high calling. But they who, with a sincere conscience and teachable hearts, are true to this Divine call, in the study and before men, in thought and in public teaching, in the pulpit and in the closet, may receive from the Lord of all the rich blessing of the peacemaker; others may win the name of great defenders of the faith, but they shall be called the children of God.

NEWMAN SMYTH.

RECOLLECTIONS OF JAPAN.

I.

THE year 1868 must ever be memorable in the history, not only of Japan, but of the world, for it saw the complete overthrow of a feudalism which had for centuries influenced the destinies of that country, keeping it in an isolation which suited neither the genius of its own people nor the enterprising spirit of the Western world. Never was such a sweeping revolution effected with less commotion. There was, indeed, a civil war; but the bloodshed was not great, and most praiseworthy clemency was shown towards the conquered party, many of whose leaders came to fill important offices under the new *régime*. Considered as to its total effects, it was a revolution of perhaps unprecedented thoroughness; but in one of its aspects it involved less change than the majority of similar convulsions, for it set no new sovereign on the throne. A dynasty was overturned; but it was not a royal dynasty, or one that had ever claimed sovereign powers. It was simply a noble house that had, through the military and diplomatic genius of its founder, Tokugawa Iyeyasu,* been placed at the head of the feudal system, and had thus come to rule the nation, professedly in the name of the Mikado or Emperor, but virtually with absolute power. The hereditary ruler of the country, member of a dynasty that now claims to be the oldest in the world, was living in the capital, Kiyôto or Miyako, while his subjects not only acknowledged his authority, but surrounded him with a halo of almost idolatrous veneration; but it was the Shôgun† in Yedo, the city which Iyeyasu had chosen as his headquarters, who, in everything except the name, discharged the imperial functions. Thus Yedo, though not the capital, was the real seat of government. The Mikado reigned, while the Shôgun ruled.

This state of affairs lasted for nearly three centuries; but, towards the close of that period, some of the most powerful clans began to falter in their allegiance to the Shôgun, and to desire the restoration of the Emperor to his rightful position, as not merely the nominal sovereign, but the actual ruler of the empire. This party increased in influence, until they succeeded in inducing the Emperor to declare war against

* The system of transliteration followed is that of Dr. Hepburn, and may be roughly stated thus:—The vowels have their Italian, and the consonants their English sounds; with regard to the latter, however, it must be noted that *g* is always hard, being pronounced either like *g* in *go*, or like *ng* in *singer*, that *ch* has always its soft sound, and that final *n* has the sound of that letter in French. The *u* of *Iyeyasu* is almost inaudible.

† Better known to foreigners as the Tycoon; but this was simply a designation (Tai Kun=Great Ruler) used in the treaties with Europe and America, and was not a title known in Japan. It is hardly necessary to add that the common belief that there were two emperors in Japan, a spiritual and a temporal, was incorrect.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

the Shôgun, and the result of this was the Revolution of 1868. When they first took up arms, the imperial party were decidedly reactionary in their political ideas. Through force of circumstances, the Shôgun had been led into making treaties with the leading powers of Europe and with the United States, and had come to have some appreciation of the advantages of intercourse with foreign nations. In these transactions he had not consulted the Emperor, thus laying himself open to a charge of treason, of which the Emperor's supporters were only too glad to take advantage. The numerous assassinations of foreigners which darkened the years immediately prior to 1868 were perpetrated by supporters of the imperial party, in order to lead the Shôgun into complications with the foreign ambassadors at his court, and not through any inbred hatred of foreigners. This fact at once explains how, on the termination of the war, the situation of foreign residents became one of perfect safety; for, during the struggle, the imperialists completely changed their policy as to foreign intercourse. They became the party of progress; and when, through the overthrow of the Shôgun, they got into power, they astonished the world by the thoroughness with which they broke loose from the old traditions, and entered on a course of enlightened reformation. Recognising Yedo as really the centre of the nation's life, they resolved to make it the capital of the empire; but, the name Yedo being associated with the Shôgun and his feudalism, they determined to abolish it, and rename the city Tôkiyô,* or Tôkei—*i.e.*, Eastern Capital. At the same time the name of Kiyôto was changed to Saikiyô*, or Saikei—*i.e.*, Western Capital.

It might be interesting, if space permitted, to consider the nature of the feudalism that so long prevailed in Japan—a feudalism which presented many parallels to that of Europe, differing from it chiefly in being more elaborately developed, and in being superimposed upon, instead of supplanting, that primitive form of society in which the family is the unit of civilisation. A dozen years ago it was dominant; now it is matter for the study of the antiquarian.

The Emperor established his court in Tôkiyô, and the system of government was entirely reorganised, various European States being taken as models for imitation. It would be impossible in the present paper to give full details of the new *régime*. Suffice it to say that a bureaucratic took the place of the old feudal government. Numerous foreigners were engaged to help in carrying out the new reforms,—British, chiefly in the public works, and the naval and finance departments; Americans, chiefly in educational matters; Frenchmen, in connection with law and military science; German physicians and surgeons,

* Generally more shortly, but less correctly, spelt Tôkiô and Saikiô. In the case of the Eastern city, the new has entirely supplanted the old name; but Kiyôto is still the more popular name of the ancient capital. With regard to the forms Tôkiyô and Tôkei, the former appears to have taken greater hold on the people, while the latter is considered by some the more scholarly.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

&c. &c. The writer had the good fortune to be invited to teach in one of the Government colleges established in Tòkiyô, and he hopes that the following notes of some of the aspects of the country and its people, which were presented to him during a residence of several years in that city, may be not uninteresting.

The city of Tòkiyô, now the capital of the empire of Nihon or Nippon,* lies near the head of a shallow bay or gulf on the eastern shore, and about midway between the southern and northern limits, of the largest of the chain of islands that form the empire. On every side but that on which it is washed by the sea, a great fertile and well-wooded plain stretches to a barrier of blue mountains, beyond and above the most westerly of which rises the peerless cone of Fuji-san,† 12,365 feet above the sea-level, and sixty miles from the city as the crow flies. This magnificent mountain can be seen from almost every part of Tòkiyô, and the house that is without a view of it is considered unlucky. During three-fourths of the year it is covered with a mantle of snow, and as it glistens in the sun-light amid a setting of brilliant blue sky, meets the city passenger at every turn, coming upon his spirit like a benediction. Incredible as the statement may appear, it is sometimes visible by moonlight on autumn nights.

Tòkiyô covers a vast area—vaster, it is said, than that of London. By the last census the population was found to be 750,000. The diffuseness of the city is due not only to the general lowness of the buildings and the suburban character of the greater part of it, but also and chiefly to the grounds of the ancient castle of Yedo, which occupy many square miles in its centre. This castle was founded in 1456, but was of very moderate extent and but little importance until 1590, when it was taken by Tokugawa Iyeyasu,‡ who made it the centre of his feudal system. He and his immediate successors greatly strengthened and enlarged it, and a very few years after his time it had reached the dimensions which it bore at the close of the Tokugawa régime. The castle limits are bounded by what, for the sake of clearness, we may regard as two moats, an outer and an inner, though there is really, exclusive of numerous little branches, only one moat, of spiral form. The inner one surrounds the castle proper, and is not less than three miles in circumference. Between this and the outer moat, which must have a circumference of at least six miles, is the ground occupied by the *yashiki*, or city mansions formerly inhabited by

* Nihon or Nippon—i.e., land of the rising sun—is the true name of the country known to us as Japan. The word Japan is an English corruption, possibly of the name given to the country by the Chinese. In all but the most recent maps, Nihon, or Nippon, or Nippon, is incorrectly given as the special name of the main island.

† More generally known to foreigners as Fuji-yama. Both *yama* and *san* mean mountain; but the latter, being of Chinese etymology, is correctly used with Fuji, which is also from the Chinese. Fuji-yama is never heard among the Japanese themselves.

‡ It should be mentioned that the Japanese follow the system of putting the more before the less general term, and therefore their names are arranged in the reverse order from ours. Tokugawa, therefore, is the family name, and Iyeyasu, the individual name.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

the feudal nobility attendant at the court of the Shôgun. The wide moats overlooked by high grassy embankments, or by walls of large neatly-fitting but uncemented stones, and crossed by embankments or bridges leading to the massive gateways (of which there were until lately no fewer than forty-eight), with their stone bastions and white curving-roofed watch-towers—not to enlarge upon the picturesque shelving pines that overhang, the stretches of magnificent lotuses that in their season cover, and the wild fowl that at times enliven, their waters—form the most striking and picturesque feature of Tôkiyô. Inside the inner moat are the extensive grounds amid which formerly stood the palace of the Shôgun. These, with their wooding of stately pines, feathery bamboos, and evergreen oaks, that even in winter make them luxuriant,—their artificial lakes, rocks, waterfalls, and hills, with the other inimitable features of Japanese landscape-gardening,—present a perfect fairyland to the visitor. To every part of the city, the ramparts, surmounted by white-walled, dark-roofed towers, look out picturesquely from amid rich, sombre foliage. Since the Revolution in 1868, however, all but a few of these watch-towers have disappeared. It is somewhat consoling to see that the iconoclastic spirit which accompanied the new reforming zeal has not as yet led to the destruction of them all. A friend of the writer, when visiting a year or two ago the castle of Wakayama in the south-east of the main island, was shocked to see the roof of the citadel so utterly neglected, that the rain was pouring in and ruining some handsome painted screens which had belonged to the former *daimiyô* of the province. Happily, no such gross neglect has yet been shown to the castle of Yedo. The pleasure-grounds are well attended to, and are thrown open to the public every Saturday. From near the citadel, a time-gun daily booms forth at noon.

But, severely as the castle-towers have suffered, almost sadder havoc still has come upon the *yashiki*, which but a few years ago were alive with all the feudal pomp of *daimiyô* and their *samurai*, or two-sworded retainers. These, as has been already mentioned, were the characteristic feature of the portion of the city lying between the outer and inner moats. Lining the sides of the broad roadways with their frontages of two storeys, unbroken except at long intervals by massive wooden gateways, these buildings, while hardly worthy to be called palaces, were of decidedly imposing appearance. The long outer buildings of each, usually forming the sides of a square, were the barracks occupied by the retainers, the nobleman's own residence being a detached building in the inner court. The size and shape of each gateway, as well as other details, were determined by the rank of the *daimiyô* who owned it. On the abolition of feudalism in 1868, all these buildings of course passed into the hands of the emperor and the new government. One is at first very naturally puzzled to understand how it came to pass that these powerful feudal chieftains so tamely gave up all their lands and their authority to the emperor, and that in return merely for a certain capital sum of money.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

For, under the Tokugawa Shôgunate, each *daimiyô* was practically an independent sovereign within his own territory. So much was this the case, that travellers required a passport to go from one province to another. The explanation lies in this, that the vast majority of *daimiyô* had come to be, in relation to their own dominions, very much what the emperor was in relation to the whole empire,—mere *fainéants*. Their territories were governed by the more able and energetic of their retainers, and it was a number of these men that had most influence in bringing about the restoration of the Mikado's authority. Intense patriots, they saw that the advancement of their country could not be realised without its unification ; and, at the same time, they cannot but have preferred the wider scope for their talents which service immediately under the Mikado would give them. From being ministers of their provincial governments, they aspired to be ministers of the imperial government. They were successful ; and their lords, who had all along been accustomed to yield to their advice, quite cheerfully acquiesced, when asked, for the good of the empire, to give up their fiefs to the Mikado. One result of this is, that Japan has now a merely titular nobility, while the country is governed almost exclusively by men who were formerly *samurai*, or feudal retainers.

Some of these *yashiki* still remain intact, but a very large number have been demolished, either to provide open spaces for parade grounds, or to give place to more or less unsightly lath-and-plaster barracks of a quasi-European style of architecture. On the sites of a few of them, more respectable Government buildings have been erected, notably on that of Naitô Yashiki, where there now rise the brick-and-stone towers of the handsome Imperial College of Engineering.

Let us take our stand at the Sakurada Gate of the castle. It is a brilliant day in autumn, we will suppose, and the hour is about ten in the morning. The old man who keeps the stall inside the gateway, with tea, rice, beans, sweetmeats, &c., will tell us how, twenty years ago, he witnessed the assassination at this gate of Ii Kamon no Kami, the Shôgun's Prime Minister. It was a cold day in winter, and thick snow covered the ground, when the long procession, having left Ii's *yashiki*, only a few hundred yards off on the opposite bank of the moat, he was here attacked by assassins. Very different is the scene that now meets our eyes. Instead of two-sworded retainers, groups of Japanese gentlemen in European clothes may be seen making their way to the different Government offices, some on foot, others in *juirikisha*, the two-wheeled perambulators invented a few years ago and now widespread throughout the empire, a few in carriages drawn by horses. From the barracks opposite, a stream of mounted soldiers in European uniform is pouring across the road to a parade-ground. Here and there are one or two men in neat blue-and-white uniform, and of rather dignified bearing ; these are members of the police force, one of the most efficient and most highly respected branches of the Government service. Soon the air is

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

resounding with bugles, and perhaps also with the strains of foreign music from a band of Japanese in French-like uniform, as the soldiers go through their drill. If we linger to have a look at the troops, a slight glance will show them to be inferior to those of Europe in respect both to the *physique* of the men and to discipline. Japanese soldiers, while they are naturally brave, do not, if we except a few crack regiments, reflect much credit on their country by their bearing. Whenever they have a holiday, they give way to their love of dissipation, and may be seen swaggering about the streets, looking slovenly and disreputable, while their swords swing from side to side in a manner that suggests the impropriety of their being entrusted with such weapons. Occasionally they have come to blows with the police, of whom they have a jealousy, all the more intense through a consciousness of their own inferiority both in social position and in efficiency. The police force is indeed a credit to Japan. Its members are almost all of the *samurai* class, and conduct themselves with becoming dignity, if indeed they do not sometimes exceed that measure of the quality. At very frequent intervals throughout Tōkiyō and the other cities and towns of the empire may be noticed their stations, neat buildings, usually in foreign style; and the order in which they keep the country is practically perfect. The efficiency of this branch of the Government service is due chiefly to the late Minister of Police, General Kawaji. Under this enlightened officer, the convict establishments had come, through the labour of the prisoners, to be self-supporting; and last year he had just returned from a visit to Europe, where he was making a fresh study of the police systems, when he unfortunately died.

While we are in what may be called the official quarter, we might take a look at some of the Government offices. On the site of the ill-fated Ii's *yashiki*, there now appears a large pile of white buildings; this is the War Office. A mile or so round the moat in the opposite direction, we find the Supreme Court of Justice, a flat-roofed edifice with unsubstantial octagonal tower, and around it the other offices of the Department of Law. Turning within one of the castle gates, and walking for some distance, we come upon the offices of the Home and Finance Departments, large and plain white buildings, surrounded by picturesquely laid-out grounds; while across the road from the latter of these two, the Paper Money Manufactory, of handsome French Renaissance architecture, demands our attention as both more substantial and more beautiful than the other foreign buildings around. Within any of these offices, or others like them in the neighbourhood, we should find scores of officials at work, sitting at desks in foreign style, the higher ones without exception in European costume, but the rest mostly in Japanese dress. The numerous charcoal boxes and tea-trays would attract our notice; for the ordinary Japanese finds it difficult to refrain long from a puff of his pipe or a sip of his tea.

As a rule, Japanese officials occupying the higher positions will be

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

found more satisfactory to deal with than those occupying the lower. It is hardly necessary to say that all are markedly polite, for politeness is a virtue inbred in the Japanese character. But the Japanese are rather prone to trouble themselves about trifles, and that even at the very time when they are thinking too lightly of some far more important matter. The more insignificant the business, the greater seems to be their tendency to magnify it. Hence there is more likelihood of meeting with officiousness in a petty officer than in one of higher rank. In such matters as paying salaries they are scrupulously exact, producing the money precisely when due, and in amount correct to the tenth of a cent, or even less. Sometimes annoyance arises through their unwillingness to sacrifice the letter of a law to its spirit. The writer met with a case which amusingly illustrates this national trait. Observing that a door was by mistake being constructed in his garden fence, he mentioned the matter to the officials, and was promptly informed that it would be removed. He was therefore surprised to see the workman, after this, still proceeding with his work, fitting on the lock, &c., &c. The reason was, that as a contract had been made with this man to fit in the door, this must be fulfilled before another contract could be entered into for its removal! Some foreigners have more pleasant relations with Japanese officials than others; but, while little annoyances, at least with the lower officers, may occasionally occur in the case of any one in their service, the writer can only say that his own experience led him to form a very high idea of those gentlemen of the Japanese Government under whom he was placed. Their uniform courtesy made it always pleasant to meet them; and, deeply ingrained although this courtesy is into the Japanese character, the officials of H.J.M. Government must often have had it severely tried by the arrogance of the rougher sons of the West.

The proceedings of the Court of Justice are conducted entirely in European style, for the old feudal law has given place to the Code Napoleon. Japan has not yet succeeded, however, in getting the abolition of those unpalatable extra-territoriality clauses in the foreign treaties, which declare European and American residents amenable to their own, and not to the Japanese, courts. The principal barristers have received part of their legal education in France, America, or England.

The gate on the outer moat that corresponds to the Sakurada Gate on the inner moat, is Tora no Mon—*i.e.*, Tiger Gate. Just within this stand buildings which cannot but arrest the attention. These belong to the Imperial College of Engineering, a Government institution to which we may devote a little time before leaving this part of the city for its busier haunts, as it offers a good example of the advance which the Japanese have recently been making in education. In themselves, the buildings call for some notice, as they are the most handsome which the Government has yet erected in foreign style. After entering by an elegant iron gate, we pass a Gothic building with a clock tower. This

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

was originally intended for the college proper, but it was at once found too small, and is now used as a museum of objects in connection with the different technical branches taught in the college,—civil, mechanical, and mining engineering, architecture, telegraphy, chemistry, and metallurgy: the collection of engineering models is said to be the most complete in the world. Opposite this building, to our right, is a long line of dormitories. Proceeding further up the avenue, we come to the main building, a chaste Italian erection forming two sides of a quadrangle. A doorway between two towers leads into the library and common hall, a very handsome room capable of containing from 1000 to 1500 persons, while the galleries are lined with bookcases stocked with over 12,000 volumes, chiefly in the English and Japanese languages. The class-rooms are arranged exactly as they might be in a European college, while the various laboratories and drawing offices are furnished with every convenience. English is the language used, the foreign staff being exclusively British. A limited number of cadets are admitted each year by examination, and after successfully passing through a six years' course—two in general literature and science, two in technical science in some selected branch, and two in applied science—they receive a degree, and are appointed to scientific posts under the Board of Public Works. The students live within the college. They wear a neat European uniform with brass buttons bearing the crest of the Board of Public Works, and the mode of life in the dormitories is European.

On Japanese students the writer likes to speak, as with them his duties brought him most intimately into contact. If one were to form his estimate of the people of Japan from a consideration of its students alone, his judgment could not fail to be highly favourable. Their invariably respectful demeanour and their imperturbable good humour, the avidity with which they drink in every one of their teacher's words, the gratitude which they show for any happy explanation that has cleared their minds of some difficulty, together with a hundred other attractions, make the work of instructing them quite a delight. And then the wonderful acuteness which at times they show, tends to keep the instructor on his mettle, for their questions are often as perplexing as they are ingenious. Their patriotism is great, and, impressed as they are with the necessity of foreign learning, their desire for the scientific advancement of their country is proportionately intense. They are apt, therefore, to overwork themselves, and an effort has often to be made to induce them to take sufficient outdoor exercise. This zeal for knowledge is no new thing in Japan. There were not wanting manifestations of it even under the long reign of feudalism. The isolation of the country, as has been already suggested, was due in no sense to popular feeling; it sprang from no spirit of exclusiveness in the national character. The Japanese have always been, as they are now, even exceedingly ready to

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

adopt what is foreign and novel. In this, as in most of their other national traits, they present a marked contrast to the Chinese, in every man, woman, and child of whom there seems to be ingrained a deep aversion to everything foreign. It is entirely her politicians that Japan has to blame for the centuries of seclusion which cramped her energies. It may have been their intense patriotism that led these men into their mistaken policy, making them fear lest some foreign power might interfere with their country's independence; but, whatever their motives may have been, they adopted a course that ill suited the spirit of their fellow-countrymen. Instances can be recorded—and there must be many more of which we can know nothing—of Japanese students displaying the truest heroism in surmounting the difficulties that lay in the way of their learning foreign science. Mr. K. Mitsukuri, in the "Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan," vol. v., pt. 1, relates a most impressive instance of this kind. In the year 1771, a young physician of Yedo, named Sugita, succeeded in obtaining a Dutch book on anatomy. Of the Dutch language he could neither read nor understand a word; but the illustrations interested him, more especially as he noticed that they represented the human organism to be very different from what the Japanese professors of anatomy taught regarding it. He conceived an intense longing to test whether the Dutch or the Japanese theory was correct. An opportunity at length occurred. He was invited to a dissection in the execution grounds of Kozukappara, Yedo. Thither, on the appointed day, he eagerly betook himself, along with two friends, Mayeda, who also had a copy of the Dutch book, and Nakagawa; and the result of the investigation was of course the thorough confirmation of the Dutch theory. The three friends were overjoyed, and at once formed a determination to master the foreign language. But how were they to proceed? They had no dictionary, and could obtain no teacher. Fortunately, however, through intercourse with the Dutch merchants who periodically came from Nagasaki to pay their respects to the Shôgun, Mayeda had learned the alphabet and about a hundred words. The three met regularly in Mayeda's house, and with his small stock of words and the help of the illustrations, they laboriously spelt their way through the volume, until, at the end of four years, Sugita had a Japanese work on anatomy ready for publication. This he issued, though at the risk of imprisonment; and he had the satisfaction of not only seeing his book tolerated, but of succeeding in presenting a copy to the Shôgun, who afterwards honoured him with an audience. To the Japanese students of this century a brighter day has dawned; and it must be confessed that they are taking full advantage of the light. With regard to their abilities, it may be said, in general, that their minds are clear rather than deep. Their past system of education has highly developed the memory, and this fact stands them in good stead with certain studies, while it is by no means altogether to their advantage.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Many of them have a singular aptitude for mathematics, and to logic and other branches of mental philosophy they turn with avidity, political economy being a special favourite. They are very neat-handed, and make capital draughtsmen. In his class on the English language and literature, the writer has received essays quite remarkable for the correctness as well as elegance of their composition; and he once was surprised at being asked to examine some hundreds of lines of verse in the style of "The Lady of the Lake," which a student had, of course without the writer's knowledge, undertaken to compose during the holidays. The subject was a battle, taken from the feudal history of Japan; and, while it would be a mistake to call the composition poetry, it was, with the exception of a few lines, singularly free from errors in grammar or versification.

As to the general moral character of Japanese students, several of their virtues have already been referred to. They of course share somewhat in the national vices; but the vast majority of those with whom the writer was privileged to come in contact seemed very free from dissipation, while there were not wanting indications of the existence among them of a high sense of honour. For example, a student once came up to the writer, on the day after a set of examination papers had been returned, and, producing his paper, showed that by mistake too many marks had been awarded him.

Special reference has been made to the Engineering College, as it is of it that the writer has the best knowledge. But similarly favourable notice might be taken of the other Government colleges, such as the Imperial University of Tôkiyô, with its Faculties of Philosophy and Literature, Science, and Law, where we might hear American and British professors lecturing in their own language to large classes of attentive and appreciative students; the Imperial Naval College, the Imperial College of Agriculture, in both of which also English is the medium of communication; the Imperial Medical College, with its German lectures; or the Imperial Military College, where French is used. The Normal School, the Ladies' College,* and not a few other secondary schools, several of them with a staff of foreign instructors, might excite our admiration. And if, on leaving the Normal School, we turned in among the truly academic groves that adjoin it, we should find ourselves in the ancient Confucian University of Yedo, the temple-like buildings of which are now used as a free public library and reading-room under the Department of Education.

While we are on the subject of education, it may be well to say that, although the recent consolidation of the empire has led to what some might consider an undue centralisation of government in the capital,—and, if we except a scientific college just established in Ôsaka, all the higher education has now its seat in Tôkiyô,—secondary and elementary

* H.J.M. the Empress takes a special interest in this, and has more than once honoured it with a visit.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

schools are broadcast throughout the empire. The traveller in the interior is refreshed, wherever he finds a village of any size, by the sight of a tidy school, surrounded by recreation grounds that ring with the laughter of troops of the most charming children. On reaching a provincial capital, he is astonished at the signs of progress around him. After the Government Offices, probably not the least prominent of the foreign buildings is the English School, or the Normal School, or the School for Ladies. When on a visit to Kôfu, a progressive little town among the mountains, about ninety miles from Tôkiyô, the writer was informed that in the prefecture of Yamanashi, of which Kôfu is the capital, there were 270 schools and 13,000 scholars. Now, Yamanashi *ken* is the smallest of the thirty-five prefectures of the empire. Aichi *ken*, of which the centre is the great city of Nagoya, about 250 miles from Tôkiyô towards Kiyôto, has no fewer than 800 schools. These two *ken* are selected simply because they have come under the writer's more immediate notice.

But to return to Tôkiyô. Around the castle there are many sights that might detain us ; but we must hasten to get a glimpse of the city in its more crowded haunts. From the Tiger Gate, a straight walk of a quarter of an hour brings us to the main street, just opposite the railway station. Every hour and a-quarter a train leaves for the port of Yokohama, eighteen miles distant down the bay. Inside the station, all the arrangements remind us of an English terminus, even to the uniforms of the officials.

Japan has now about seventy-five miles of railway, in addition to what is at present under construction. The longest line is that from Hiyôgo or Kôbé, the open port on the Inland Sea, to Ôsaka, the second largest city of the empire, twenty miles along the coast, and thence past Kiyôto, thirty miles inland from Ôsaka, to Ôtsu, seven miles beyond the ancient capital. Ôtsu lies at the southern extremity of Lake Biwa, a sheet of water fifty miles in length. Between Ôtsu and the north end of the lake at Shiwôtsu, steamers ply regularly ; and a railway is being constructed across the hills that divide Shiwôtsu from Tsuruga, on the west coast of Japan, only thirteen miles distant. In a very short time, therefore, it will be possible to cross the main island by steam.

WILLIAM GRAY DIXON.

THE ORIGINALITY OF COWPER'S POETRY.

IF originality be one of the main tests of genius, then Cowper is perhaps one of the most undoubted geniuses of the whole of the last century. Not that the century was by any means devoid of its men of even transcendent imagination. On the contrary, it is doubtful if ever there was a time when the country was so rich in varied and even brilliant originality. And this is all the more extraordinary because there was certainly, both in the poetry and the philosophy of the day, a singular absence of anything like spirituality. But this destitution only created a ceaseless craving for something to supply its place, which led to an intellectual activity that has never been surpassed—an activity that sought to express itself only in the finest achievements of art and science. The truth is, devoid of strong moral earnestness as the age was, it was not without an earnestness and an enthusiasm of its own. That enthusiasm, however, was purely of an æsthetic type; its æsthetic sense was developed at the expense of its moral. Art and science had not only taken possession of the best minds, but had in reality taken the place of religion; and in the pursuit of both there was no lack of the highest imagination. The imagination, however, did little or nothing for religion, for the simple reason that there was no true religion at all. The endless theories and hypotheses of the day, the love of speculation, the scepticism, the daring and fearless doubt, are but so many proofs of its wonderful imaginative power. In point of fact, the scientific imagination has never been keener or bolder. It had all the *abandon*, and all the love of liberty, and all the elated consciousness of unrestrained delight so characteristic of the poetic outburst of Shakespeare's day. There never was a time when ingenious and captivating theories were more common; for science had not reached the sober statistical stage of modern days, and statistics are not conducive to *abandon* and daring.

But, after all, beneath the daring a love of ingenuity is as conspicuous as a love of truth; and this love of ingenuity is but another phase of the protean passion for effect which was ingrained in the age. Execution, finish, polish, elegance, accomplishment, were all loved for their own sakes, and as nothing else was loved. Writers concerned themselves as much with the mode as with the matter of their expressions, so much so that even now we turn to the writings of the greatest sceptic of the day, who is also the greatest sceptic of all times, as the finished model of all literary style. Not even the preachers and patriots were free from the influence, for they expostulated and argued and taught as much for the love of logical effect as for the sake of righteousness. There is a severe earnestness running through the whole of such a work as

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Butler's wonderful "Analogy;" but it is the peculiar earnestness of the times, the earnestness of a skilled and accomplished fencer, who is only safe from ridicule in the complete overthrow of his enemy. He is armed at all points, and parries and thrusts with all the coolness and confidence of the ablest of his adversaries. It is doubtful, however, notwithstanding its marvellous ability, if "The Analogy" ever thoroughly convinced one single opponent, or made one bad man good, for its method is purely argumentative, and its end negative; and, after all, the Christian religion came to save—even sceptics—and not to destroy. Logic is not religion.

This overmastering and universal love of finish reveals at once the strong artistic tendency of the age, and its deepest want—the want of a high and a noble inspiration. Where polish and finish are the source and the end of inspiration, the ideal can never be a high one; the very worst form of realism will in the end necessarily result; the art will become artificial; affectation and studied formalism will take the place of simplicity and spontaneity; and even genius and imagination will be perverted from their highest functions, only to increase the evil.

Now, this is exactly what took place with the poetry of the period. Instead of being the highest, it was the most worthless of the arts of the day; and it was so, because, like the religion of the day, it was inspired with no fine enthusiasm; it had no noble aim, it had absolutely no ideal whatever to impart; it was utterly destitute of any kind of faith or hope or charity, believing neither in humanity nor itself. In fact, it was but a cold, glittering mirror of the very polished and cynical society of the drawing-room. It did not reflect even the most charming or the most interesting phases of that society. The novelists were truer artists. The poetry was not only "without romance," but without any creative power at all. It drew no charm whatever from heaven above or the earth beneath, from nature or mankind, from a golden age of the past, or a glorious utopia of the future. Laboured and studied finish, after a fixed plan of "easy numbers" and faultless rhymes, had discouraged all originality and destroyed all simplicity. But what was worse, the poetry had no subtle or valuable influence on men, for it had neither reverence, nor awe, nor love, nor even passion,—and in poetry a short-sighted or even a bad passion, and a mistaken enthusiasm, are better than none. In short, it neither thrilled nor quickened; it neither subdued nor exalted; it was negative to the core, colourless, passionless, monotonous, and altogether artificial,—as different from the grand, impulsive, ennobling poetry of the Elizabethan era, or that of the glorious generation which succeeded Cowper, as the placid monotony of a useful canal differs from the music of a full stream bounding to sea in the dawn. Satire was its characteristic feature, but even its satire stung to little or no purpose.

Nothing is more striking than the difference between Cowper's satire

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

and that of the period—it is a difference altogether of kind; and nothing could indicate more clearly, not only the originality of Cowper's poetry, but the advent of a noble inspiration. The satire of the period was at best but little better than polished and incisive slander; its personal element was its keenest, but it was also its only sting. There was neither mercy nor pity blended with its blame. It aroused no true remorse, it excited no genuine joy, no hearty laughter. Above all, it reclaimed no heart, it swept away no vice, and it led the way to no reform whatever. Cowper's satire, on the other hand, is as impersonal and as unselfish as his love of virtue, for it is based on a high faith in humanity. It is as impersonal as it is constructive, and altogether arose from his fine nature being as sensitive to the absence as to the presence of high influences.

The striking originality of his poetry was from the very outset manifested not only in his pronounced religious tone, but even in the very subject of his verse.

It was something startlingly new to find a poet deliberately choosing such bold commonplace themes as Table Talk, Conversation, Retirement, and such like. If it indicated nothing else, however, it indicated the possibility of an altogether new departure from the beaten and hackneyed path of poetry. This in itself was no small matter. But the world was not prepared for such originality. It rejected the small book of verse, and accepted the verdict of the dullest of its many obscure scribes, "that it was no better than a dull sermon." So it has ever been, for it needs a genius to detect a genius. This first reception was all the more extraordinary, because his very next work took the whole world by storm. All at once, the world was enchanted, and discovered that there was a true poet in the land, a very Jaques of the Forest of Arden. Yet the one work was a true forerunner of the other, the only essential difference between them being the introduction of a most fascinating and a most exalted egotism. This, after all, was but the flowering of the same delightful genius. The sincerity, the earnestness, the love of pensive solitude, with its accompanying love of nature, mankind, and God, are the same in both works. And it was precisely this charming sincerity and this high moral tone that were so very new. Even in the most moral of "The Moral Satires" there is not the slightest trace of affectation. Everywhere the author is easy, graceful, and, while very pious, delightfully natural. As he tells us himself, "his raptures are not conjured up to serve occasions of poetic pomp, but genuine." His genuineness of emotion, his love of pure and exquisite spontaneity—even to the extent of a complete carelessness of method and plan—apart altogether from his lofty moral tone and delicious musings in retirement, not only strike new chords of poetry in the literature of the day, but reveal the fact that it is quite a new order of poet who is striking the chords. He will write of nothing of which his whole soul is not full, yet his genius will only concern itself with what most concerns him in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

his grandest and most silent moods. It is no wonder, therefore, that he despises the poetaster who carols—

"Some bonny Caledonian air,
All birks and braes, though he was never there."

Affectation, insincerity, even poetic exaggeration he loathes as falsehood. Much as he loves and much as he was influenced by Milton, he has not a trace of his splendid pedantry. To take up such a poem, even now-a-days, as "*The Task*," or even "*Retirement*," is like taking a peaceful stroll in the woods on a summer evening. Although a hundred years have passed away, we still feel, with his contemporaries, that we are in a fresh and an altogether delightful atmosphere; and all the more so because we are in the company of a poet who reflects the fresh beauty, the peacefulness, the loveliness, and the solitary grandeur of nature as wonderfully and as sweetly as a tranquil lake among the mountains reflects the glory of the midnight sky. Cowper's poetry is a protest and a reaction against the shallow affectation and the insincerity of his fellow poets.

But affectation and insincerity were not by any means the only characteristics of the time; for in the universal hunger after artistic perfection, there was no poverty of true genius. Decayed and corrupt as the poetry of the time was, art never flourished more beautifully; never were there so many painters, musicians, orators, and even actors in the land, and all of the very highest order. It was at this time that Gainsborough, Reynolds, and Hogarth painted their undying pictures. It was at this time that Pitt thrilled the country with his passionate patriotism; and in introducing into the House of Commons "the gestures and emotions of the stage," he only proclaimed himself a true child of his era. It was at this time that Garrick delighted crowded audiences of the most fastidious critics, as perhaps no actor had ever delighted the most impressionable and the most vulgar throngs. It was also at this time, and in this very company, that Handel composed his marvellous oratorios. Nor, on the other hand, has the country ever been richer in historians, novelists, critics, and even conversationalists. The truth is, the spirit of the age was the spirit of art. "*The Vicar of Wakefield*," "*Tom Jones*," and "*Tristram Shandy*," are all of this period, and it is not too much to say that they have never been surpassed as works of pure fiction.

But perhaps the most important manifestation of this artistic spirit—as certainly it was its highest development—was in the direction of historical literature. History, indeed, as an art, may be said to have been created at this era, or rather, the drama may be said to have been born again in history: Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon were artists of the very highest order. In point of fact, Gibbon's "*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*" was the epic of the age; it was the highest incarnation of all the best tendencies and influences of the artistic spirit of the times.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1890.]

For cold loftiness of spirit, splendid majesty of style, haughty reserve, and conscious strength, it might be the product of the proudest of Romans. It is so artistically conceived that even the bias imparted to the work is the bias of a haughty Roman in the palmiest days of the Empire; in this altogether differing from Hume, who rather imparts to his story the animus of the clever scepticism of his time.

Even the every-day conversation of ordinary society became a studied art, and Dr. Johnson himself was in this respect the most successful, because he was the least spontaneous and the most epigrammatic conversationalist of his day. It is significant of the times that the biography of Johnson is written in the very same spirit. Boswell sinks, and even frequently degrades, his own personality, solely for the full perfection of his picture; and Lord Macaulay's estimate of his literary character is as curious as it is fierce. Boswell is not even "the noted Puritan" of which Thackeray complains. On the contrary, he is a true product of his times, and the age in which he lived had absolutely nothing in common with Puritanism. Boswell constantly thrusts himself into the background in order that nothing may interfere with the fine perspective of his story, consequently his biography is perhaps the very best that has ever been written. Like the vigorous fiction of the day, it is a comprehensive and a genuine reflection of the era. For dramatic power and artistic consistency, it will compare with the most finished of Fielding's or Smollett's fictions.

Now, nothing could be more different from this than the poetry of Cowper. There is absolutely nothing of the dramatic quality in his genius. He is not an artist, any more than he is a scientific savan. This is apparent even in his charming little pictures and vignettes of rural life. No descriptions could be more finished and more elegant. They are made to be carried about. So far, he is a genuine painter—one of the Little Masters; but only so far, for he not only carefully and studiously paints in the minutest details of his scenes and characters, leaving nothing for the reader's imagination, but unconsciously, although very forcibly, he also paints himself as an integral part of them all. Not only his character, but his presence is in every one of his pictures. Nay more; his attitude, his face, his smile, his frown interest us more than all his descriptions, and make them sweet. But self-exclusion is the very essence of art. The artist must not only hide his art, but he must most carefully and most thoroughly hide himself. So much has this been studied by our greatest poets, that it would be perfectly possible to enjoy the works of Shakespeare or Scott without knowing one single incident of their lives, or one single anecdote of their biography. Hundreds, and even thousands, sing Burns' songs who never even heard of him. The disappearance of the author is as essential to the full significance of his work as the sinking of the sun is to the full splendour of a starry night. But to drop Cowper from his verse would simply be to extinguish his poetry. Unlike the artists of the day—even the very best of them—

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

he boldly relies upon himself and his own imaginings for all his interest. Herein he entirely differed from the only great poet of his day whom he most resembled—Robert Burns. It is very questionable if Cowper could have written even one of Burns' songs, for, as he tells us himself, he was not one of those who "strain their all into a song." He might have been able to have composed the exquisite lines on a Daisy or a Field Mouse, for their love of nature—animate and inanimate—was of the same order. He might even, on a rare occasion, have been stimulated to the hasty dictation of a mild Revolutionary Ode. But it is simply inconceivable that he could, under any circumstances, have been the author of such a work as "The Jolly Beggars." Not that he was devoid of humour, for indeed he was full of it. No writer of pathos is devoid of humour. Nor was it due to the fact that he had absolutely none of the ploughman's wild affections and splendid imagination. But his strong moral sense, his habitual introspection, and his unconquerable self-consciousness, were incompatible with the requirements of even the simplest dramatic work. As it so happens, on more than one occasion he also introduces "Jolly Beggars" into his verse. But his picture is solemnly—almost comically—realistic, without one touch of imagination. He cannot make himself a gipsy, any more than he can make himself a bishop. From a comfortable distance, he looks placidly and calmly upon "the vagabond and useless tribe, eating their miserable meal;" and their main importance for him lies in their contribution to his fine scenery on the one hand, and, on the other, in the occasion they afford him of indulging in his most delightful musings. Not that Cowper could not sympathise with a tinker; he could even occasionally sympathise with a bishop! No poet had more sterling or more noble sympathy—extending as it did, wherever sorrow and weakness and outrage and tyranny existed. But he had little or no artistic imagination. He had little or none of the genius that is capable of sinking its personality in order to differentiate its genius into all other kinds of personalities. His imagination was of quite a different order: it was introspective and prospective, and herein lay the whole of the originality of his poetry. In his retirement from the outer world his imagination was full, not of men, but of man,—not of man as he was, but as he might be. This glorious ideal vision was with him by day and by night, and imparted to his verse a lofty moral tone that came upon the world like an inspiration. This solitary singer is neither an artist, nor a philosopher, nor a scientific savan—being utterly incapable of explaining any mystery under the sun—but he is a seer of such visions, and a dreamer of such dreams, that

"His ear is pained,
His soul is sick with every day's report
Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled."

Nothing could show this ideal tendency of his genius more thoroughly

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

than the wonderful lines to his mother's picture. This noble hymn to a beautiful memory—for his mother passed away from him when he was but a wondering child—is the passionate utterance of a soul that has yearned all his days for ideal purity and love. The picture is but a symbol of the far away dreams. No mediæval devotee's adoration of the Madonna could be sweeter or purer.

In point of fact, the world in which he lived was a world of mystery and wonder; and "the fanatical antipathy to natural science" which so irritates men like Mr. Goldwin Smith,* is in reality but a fanatical sympathy with reverence, and the very highest religious instincts. The unseen and the eternal are all the grander to him for their mystery, and the Revelation and the Cross to which he so passionately clings are the greatest mysteries of all. "Whence we have come and whither we go" were then, just as they are now, not only the most baffling but also the most crying questions of the day. But to this secluded and exceedingly pious poet these problems were not by any means so baffling, nor nearly so wonderful as the fact of our being at all. For Cowper, this is a perpetual miracle—a miracle whereby all existence becomes sacred in his eyes, for all existence has a sacred purpose to fulfil. It is this sacred purpose that makes him a moralist in spite of himself. It is this that makes him, like his fore-runner in the Forest of Arden,—

"Find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

It is this that exalts his love of nature into a tenderness that is simply sublime. He cannot so much as look upon the flowers, and the hares, and the very worms of the field, without his poetry being stirred with musings of the most pathetic kind. Thus he says—

"I am recompensed, and deem the toils
Of poetry not lost, if verse of mine
May stand between an animal and woe,
And teach one tyrant pity for his drudge."

There is nothing living to which his nature does not feel a subtle kinship, and in behalf of which he does not yearn for peace.

But more than this; the loveliness of nature is all-sufficient to charm him without any reference to a metaphysical pantheism. To Cowper, a primrose is a yellow primrose and nothing more. He asks, he requires nothing more of it. It needs no theory to give it loveliness; it needs no philosophical or scientific insight to perceive its charms. It is not so much a symbol of unknown and indefinite glory, it is not so much a mystic suggestion "too deep for tears," as it is a living presence of sweetness,—almost a companion, a fellow-mortal whose sweetness and purity are to be cultivated and enjoyed like friendship, without ques-

* See Cowper—"Men of Letters," By Goldwin Smith.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

tioning and without measure. He speaks of it, and tends it, and watches it as if it were the lovely body of some lovely spirit.

In this unalloyed and pure delight he resembles Shelley rather than Wordsworth, but he approaches both of them rather than the age in which he lived. In fact, he had absolutely nothing in common with the spirit of his times. He stood all alone, not only in the seclusion of his village life, but in his introspection and fearless egotism. "Know thyself," is the keynote of all his poetry; "Know the world," was the highest cry of the day. To Cowper, and well-nigh to Cowper alone of all the great writers of his time, the individual soul, in its great solitary relationships, was the one object of supreme interest, the one study worthy of the highest genius. But the whole tendency of the age was to underrate and even to despise the individual. There was but little faith in individual effort, and the shallow cynicism of society was but the unconscious expression of this unbelief. This tendency was, in a great measure, the result of both the artistic and the scientific spirit of the times; for the artists and poets and novelists and biographers and historians took serious cognisance of mankind only for the sake of its models,—and models of mankind are not to be found in the common herd. On the other hand, man's paltry individuality became reduced to a point of nothingness before the marvellous prospect of secondary causes involved in the speculations of the scientific inquirer. Human life was too insignificant an object to be taken into serious account as an agent of any kind, for the earth itself was but a grain of sand in that starry scheme of matter which so dazzled the fine imagination of science. Scepticism in individual effort, even individual worth, was almost a necessity.

It may be said, and with justice, that Cowper's standpoint was after all but the standpoint of the Puritan. So far as the Puritan was fired by the belief of individual worth and the native dignity of the individual soul, this is true. But Cowper's standpoint was on a higher, a sublimer ground. Cowper valued the individual soul because he valued and passionately loved the whole race. Puritanism also loved humanity, but it loved Puritan humanity more. Puritanism had little of the beauty, the tenderness, the sympathy, and the wonder of Cowper's imagination. It was single-eyed in its aim, pre-eminently practical. One of its best features was its patriotism—it was strongly, passionately patriotic,—not more so, however, than Cowper; and with this remarkable difference, that Cowper's patriotism implied the very widest cosmopolitanism. He loved his own country—not only because it was his native land, but because of all others it most loved the world. And Cowper's cosmopolitanism even possesses something more than the defiant revolutionary thrill which found its best and noblest utterance in such a song as "A man's a man for a' that," for he represents the world as not only made for the benefit of every individual man, but, grander still, every man as specially made for the benefit of the world.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

There is little wonder that the world was at last fascinated with so delightful and so exalted a writer. To have the whole inner life of such a poet fearlessly and charmingly evolved before the reader's eye was a splendid revelation—it was precisely the kind of revelation of which the world most stood in need.

There were many courageous, many fearless, and many brilliant minds in the eighteenth century. In his retirement, however, and in his high musings, Cowper is not the least striking figure of them all. He stands absolutely alone. But his solitude is the splendid solitude of a prophet, whose voice will reach through the ages.

DAVID SIME.

ISRAEL AND ASSYRIA ACCORDING TO THE MONUMENTS.

THE rise of the Assyrian power has not received very full elucidation from the inscriptions hitherto recovered. The indications we possess seem to show that the earliest rulers of Assyria were "viceroys" of the kings of Chaldea, who reigned at Babylon. Having asserted their independence, they had, for a long series of reigns, to defend themselves against the Babylonian monarchs seeking to recover their authority, while at the same time they were consolidating their power. It was impossible that, in these circumstances, they could make themselves heard of beyond their own dominions, or attempt any career of conquest in the West. This period of the growth of the Assyrian power corresponds generally with that from the time of Joshua till the later Judges. About that time, however, a monarch of superior vigour and ability ascended the Assyrian throne, who not only subdued Babylon, but carried his arms through Asia Minor and Phœnicia. But his second successor, "conquered in a decisive battle by the King of the Hittites in the north of Syria, lost all the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser I. beyond the Euphrates—an event which made way for the external development, a short time afterwards, of the power of David and Solomon, and the temporary extension of the rule of the Israelitish monarchy as far as the river beyond which Mesopotamia begins. The warlike outburst of Assyria was repressed for a time; and Egypt, torn by the quarrels of the sovereign High-Priests of Thebes and the Tanite kings of the twenty-first dynasty, could no longer dream of conquest" (Lenormant, *Premières Civilisations*, ii. 216).

These words put us briefly in possession of the circumstances which allowed of the conquests of David, and the large and great dominion of Solomon. To one who turns his attention exclusively to the extensive influence and the warlike propensities of the chief powers that surrounded the land of Israel, it seems at first sight difficult to conceive that there was room or opportunity for the rise, even for the short period during

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

which it lasted, of an empire such as Solomon's. But the difficulty is removed when we see that the Hittites in the north were first weakened both by the invasion of more remote tribes, which occurred in the time of the twentieth Egyptian dynasty, and then by the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser I.; that the Assyrians in their turn had their power broken for the time by the blow which these Hittites struck for life, and that Egypt, the while, was weakened by internal dissension. And it cannot be doubted that these wars and conquests of the Assyrian king, approaching so near their northern border, must have been one of the motives which induced the Israelites to urge their demand for a king to go out before them and fight their battles.

The dissensions in Egypt, to which allusion has been made, seem also to have owed their origin to the conquests of Assyria. For the twenty-first dynasty, which ruled at Bubastis and Memphis while the dynasty afterwards represented by Tirhakah was establishing itself in "Ethiopia," is distinguished by the purely Assyrian forms of the names of its kings. According to Brugsch, a descendant of a previous dynasty had married an Assyrian princess, and being driven from his inheritance, the Assyrian kings had invaded and made themselves masters of Egypt. The Shishak of the times of Solomon and Rehoboam is the first of the line who finally broke off from his Assyrian associations, and occupied, as an independent monarch, the throne of Egypt. He is succeeded by descendants bearing such names as Usarkon (=Sargon), Takeloth (=Tiglath), and Nemaroth (=Nimrod). His connection with Assyria, and the way in which his family obtained the throne of Egypt, would very naturally lead him to take up the cause of a banished claimant to a kingdom which had extended its borders far more extensively in the direction of Assyria, than it had attempted to do on the side of Egypt. Moreover, the Pharaoh whose daughter Solomon had married was probably one of the very line which had dethroned his kindred, and which his father had in turn driven from power. As a memorial of Shishak's expedition against Judah, there remains a long list of towns and cities which had been conquered, many of which can be recognised as Bible names; but there are no historical details to fill in the story.

For some 200 years after this, the Scripture narrative gives no indication of any direct contact between the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and the empires of Egypt and Assyria. The foreign power with which the kings of Israel had to contend during this period was the Syrian monarchy, established at Damascus; while the kings of Judah had to encounter occasional invasions of plundering hordes from the south. All this affords a sure indication that both Egypt and Assyria were too much occupied with their internal affairs, and weakened by civil war, to exercise any influence beyond their own borders. The memorials of the Egyptian history of the period are very scanty, affording little beyond the mere names of otherwise unknown kings, who reigned, many of them, only over a part of the country. One inscription, however,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

records hostile irruptions, both from north and south, such as the kingdom of Judah was also exposed to at the time. As regards Assyria, comparatively little light has yet been thrown on its condition during this period. But it seems evident, from the information we possess, that there was going on an almost constant struggle between Nineveh and Babylon, for supremacy on the one side, and for continued independence on the other. Repeatedly conquered by the armies of the Assyrians, and reduced to the position of a vassal State, Babylon as often rebelled again, and kept the strength of Assyria fully occupied in maintaining the ascendancy of Nineveh. One of the Assyrian monarchs who was most successful in reducing the power of Babylon was a Shalmaneser, who began to reign about the time of Ahab. He gained such complete mastery of the empire that he was able to carry his arms westwards as far as Damascus and Hamath. There are distinct references in the accounts of his wars to the conquest of Benhadad and Hazael of Damascus, coupled with a somewhat uncertain allusion to Ahab and to Jehu. From the latter he is said to have received tribute, and of the former he is said (if the wording of the name be correct) to have destroyed 2000 chariots and 10,000 men who were fighting in the army of Benhadad as his allies—a circumstance perfectly possible during the three years of peace and friendship between Benhadad and Ahab (1 Kings xx. 34; xxii. 1). Whether the words be correctly interpreted as a reference to these kings of Israel or not, it is evident that these victories of Shalmaneser over Syria prepared the way for the partial restoration of the power and prosperity of the kingdom of Israel which took place under Jeroboam II., especially as this outburst of warlike energy in Assyria was followed by another period of weakness so great as even to allow of the temporary preponderance of Babylon. The question of the identity of "Pul, King of Assyria," who is described (1 Chron. v. 26) as being the first to begin the real subjugation and captivity of Israel, has been very largely discussed, without very much additional light being thrown upon it. Such a name does not occur among the Ninevite kings, unless, with some, we are to suppose that it represents the first part of Vul-nirari. But it seems the most natural course to accept the statement of Berosus, whose accuracy every new discovery more fully establishes, and recognise in Pul a king of Babylon who had succeeded in making himself master, if not of Nineveh itself, at least of the foreign empire of Assyria. The accession of Tiglath-Pileser to the throne of Nineveh speedily put an end to the supremacy of Babylon. Not directly descended from the previous line of monarchs, he brought to the government of the empire fresh power and energy, and soon showed himself one of the most warlike and successful monarchs that had ever led the armies of Assyria. With his reign commences the period of Assyria's greatest renown, and one of which we possess very full and abundant memorials in the series of inscriptions which record the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser

and of several of his successors. In fact, so abundant are now the materials for Assyrian history and chronology that, while difficulties hitherto have arisen from the want of definite chronology, they now arise much more from the impossibility of satisfactorily reconciling the various detailed accounts we possess. It is quite unnecessary for our present purpose to enter into questions like these, and the progress of discovery will every year throw clearer light upon them.

The campaign of Tiglath-Pileser against Damascus, which he undertook at the request of Ahaz, is fully described, and his transportations of large masses of population from one part of the empire to another (2 Kings xv. 29) form a prominent feature in his inscriptions. "In the great court which he held at Damascus, after the defeat of Rezin, twenty-five kings, some of whom came from the foot of the Caucasus, prostrated themselves before him as his subjects; among the number, the Assyrian documents mention Ahaz, King of Judah; and the Bible narrates how this prince went to Damascus to do homage to the King of Assyria (2 Kings xvi. 11-16), and how, on his return, he introduced idolatrous rites into the temple of Jehovah" (Lenormant, *Premières Civilisations*, ii. 222.)

This last growth of the Assyrian power brought on that crisis in the history of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes which, heralded by unheeded prophetic warnings, issued in their overthrow and captivity. It is stated in 2 Kings xvii. 3 that it was Shalmaneser who came up against Hoshea at first, and in narrating the subsequent siege and conquest of Samaria no new king is named. Some difficulty was felt, therefore, when it was found in the "Annals of Sargon" that he claimed the capture of Samaria as his own deed. "Samaria I besieged, I captured. 27,290 people dwelling in the midst of it I carried captive." Again, certain "remote tribes," "who to any of our kings their taxes had not brought; in the service of Assur, my lord, I destroyed them; and the rest of them I removed, and in the city of Samaria I placed them." It is now generally believed that Shalmaneser had died childless after the war against Israel was begun, and that after some months of interregnum, the throne was filled by the leaders of the army in Syria electing Sargon, under the augury of an eclipse of the moon, which took place on 19th March, 721.

We read (2 Kings xvii. 4) that Hoshea had sent messengers to So, King of Egypt, hoping to obtain help from him in rebelling against the King of Assyria. The time most likely to be chosen for such a step would be during the disorder that ensued upon the death of Shalmaneser. But no help was to be looked for from So. His name occurs as Shabak on the Egyptian monuments, but all that can be learned of him is that he was one of the petty kings among whom the land was divided before Tirhakah succeeded in establishing his paramount authority over the whole. In fact, he is called, in Sargon's inscriptions, "General of Egypt," and from them it appears that he had made

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

some effort to effect a diversion in favour of Hoshea, but was signally defeated. It was not without reason, therefore, that the Assyrians taunted Hezekiah and his officers with the hopelessness of looking to Egypt for help, and however it might disappoint their cherished hopes, it could not seem an unlikely prediction when Isaiah depicted the weakness of Egypt, and announced its speedy conquest by the King of Assyria (Isa. xix. ; xx. ; xxx. ; xxxi.)

Considerable light has been thrown upon the transactions of the time of Hezekiah by the Assyrian records. The troubles that were connected with the death of Shalmaneser and the accession of Sargon afforded opportunity to others besides Hoshea to make an attempt at gaining independence. The memory of its ancient supremacy had never been extinguished in Babylon, and it seems that at this time Merodach-Baladan, originally ruler of a small principality near the Persian Gulf, was summoned to take the sovereignty of the city and its dependencies, and strike a blow for freedom. Sargon was occupied for several years with his western wars against Samaria, the Philistines (Isa. xx. 1), and the neighbouring countries. Merodach-Baladan made use of the interval allowed him to strengthen his position by alliances with neighbouring powers. "For twelve years," says Sargon in one of his inscriptions, "he has been sending embassies, contrary to the will of the gods." Of one of these we read in 2 Kings xx. 12. Merodach-Baladan had evidently the more reason to hope that Hezekiah would render him what assistance he could, because the King of Judah now stood almost alone among the western princes in retaining comparative independence, and could not therefore but expect that the Assyrians would take the first opportunity of subduing him.* Merodach-Baladan did not succeed in maintaining his position against the power of Sargon, who speedily subdued Babylon. But it was left for his son, Sennacherib, to attempt the chastisement of Hezekiah for his willingness to listen to the proposals of Merodach-Baladan, and for his rebellion against the authority of Assyria, which probably took place at the time of the assassination of Sargon and the accession of Sennacherib. Sennacherib's wars against Judea are distinctly recorded in his inscriptions. It is probably an allusion to the campaign of Hezekiah against the Philistines (2 Kings xviii. 8), when he says: "The priests, princes, and people of Ekron who Padi their king, faithful and steadfast to Assyria, in bonds of iron placed, and to Hezekiah, King of Judah, gave him as an enemy; for the evil they did their hearts feared." He then tells us how he brought this Padi out of the midst of Jerusalem and restored him to his throne, and proceeds (comp. 2 Kings xviii. 13-16): "And Hezekiah, King of Judah, who did not submit to my yoke, 46 of his strong cities, fortresses, and small cities which were round them, which were without number. . . . I besieged, I captured. . . . Him like a caged bird, within Jerusalem his royal

* See on this whole subject, and on the necessary order in which the events of Hezekiah's reign must be placed, Lenormant, *Premières Civilisations*, ii. 231-241.

city, I had made. . . . He, Hezekiah, fear of the might of my dominion overwhelmed him, . . . and they inclined to submission with 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver,* vases of metal, precious carbuncles, pearls, great onyx stones, chests of ivory, carved thrones of ivory, tusks of ivory, weapons, everything, a great treasure." Whatever may have been the circumstances which led to Sennacherib's renewed hostility against Jerusalem, whether Hezekiah's fortifying of the city, or the intervention in his favour of Tirhakah, "King of Ethiopia," we are distinctly told that it was this last movement that drew him ultimately away from Judea. This Tirhakah was in reality an Ethiopian king of Egypt. One of the numerous dethroned dynasties of Egypt had become established in Ethiopia at the city of Nap or Napata (the Noph of Scripture), and called themselves "Kings of the Land of Cush." They took advantage of every period of weakness and dissension in Egypt, and gradually pushed their frontier northwards down the valley of the Nile, until they had made themselves masters of Thebes, and at last, under Tirhakah, of Lower Egypt also. While thus at the zenith of his power, Tirhakah came out to meet Sennacherib, and was saved, along with Hezekiah, by the dire destruction wrought by "the angel of the Lord" in the camp of the Assyrians. Of course, the final catastrophe is carefully suppressed in the Assyrian records, but there are not wanting facts and turns of expression which receive new significance in the light of it. After Sennacherib's return to Nineveh, Babylon is found rising anew in insurrection under the leadership of Merodach-Baladan, who had retired to his hereditary principality; and Sennacherib describes himself as assembling the "totality" of his army, an expression in which Lenormant sees an indication of his calling out his whole reserves to make up for his losses in the west. Before the close of his reign, Sennacherib resolved upon the utter destruction of Babylon. He carried off the statues of its gods to Nineveh, tore down and burned the temples, and threw down the fortifications. But such a city as Babylon was not to be extinguished in a day, and Esarhaddon revoked his father's policy. He ensured its obedience by making it his own residence, and began the great works of fortification which were only completed by Nebuchadnezzar, and which enter into Herodotus's description of the city in its glory. Hence it is that we find that "the captains of the host of the King of Assyria" took Manasseh and "carried him to Babylon." This capture of Manasseh is the only indication in the Scripture narrative of the long and successful wars of Esarhaddon in Palestine and Egypt. His inscriptions contain a long list of kings, besides Manasseh, whom he had subdued—"twenty-two kings of the Hittites, beside the sea and in the midst of the sea," kings of Tyre, Sidon, and various cities in Cyprus. He also subdued Tirhakah, "King of Kush," and describes in striking detail the difficulties he surmounted in his march through the desert "from the

* Lenormant states that the great talent of the Hebrews and the minor talent of Babylon and Assyria were to one another exactly in the proportion of eight to three.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

city of Aphek to the boundary of the stream of Egypt." Immediately upon Esarhaddon's death, however, Tirhakah raised the standard of revolt against Assyria, and brought on himself and his kingdom the vengeance of Assurbanipal, the last great warrior among the Ninevite kings, who pushed his conquest as far as Thebes itself (Nahum iii. 8-10). The destruction of Nineveh, which followed within forty or fifty years, left Egypt free for a time to regain some measure of power, and to stimulate the hopes of those in Jerusalem, who thought by its help to resist the might of Babylon. The expedition of Necho to Carchemish and his interference in the affairs of Judea, together with the flight of the remnant of Judah to seek the protection of Pharaoh-hophra, are indications of renewed strength in Egypt. Of these Pharaohs we have the names in the inscriptions, but nothing more; and their power, such as it was, was but the last expiring gleam of Egypt's glory, soon to be finally extinguished by Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses.

No recent additions have been made to our knowledge of the history of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Excavations have not been carried to the same extent among the ruins of Babylon as among those of Nineveh, and it seems doubtful if the friable brickwork of Babylonia will ever yield the same results as the more solid material with which the palaces of Nineveh were lined. Perhaps it is this very circumstance, however, that has led to the preservation of a very remarkable collection of documents, belonging to a Babylonian firm of money-lenders, now in the British Museum. The so-called Library of Assurbanipal at Nineveh, from the remains of which so many of the most interesting religious and mythological inscriptions have been recovered, seems to have been found simply scattered on the floor of the room where it was kept. But the money-lenders of Babylon had more regard for their vouchers, and stored them carefully in jars. A number of these were found near Hillah, a town in the neighbourhood of Babylon, in a mound, part of which had been washed away by the rains. Their contents were purchased at Baghdad by the late lamented George Smith, and reached London in the end of 1876. The collection contains two or three thousand tablets, each of which records a separate financial transaction; and their special value lies in the fact that they are all carefully dated. The year of the reigning king is stated, and the name of the head of the firm at the time. One tablet dates from the fourth year of Esarhaddon; but the regular sequence does not commence till the third year of Nebuchadnezzar, from which it goes on, with occasional blanks, to the end of the reign of Darius Hystaspes. The chronology thus furnished, in the most simple and natural way, tends upon the whole to confirm the accuracy of the "Canon of Ptolemy," upon which our knowledge of the reigns and succession of the kings of that period has hitherto rested. Little light, however, has been thrown by these tablets upon the old questions of the identity of Belshazzar and of Darius the Mede. One of them, no

doubt, is dated in the third year of Marduk-sar-uzar, at the very time when we should expect to find Belshazzar's name. And as the only difference between the two names is in the name of the deity which commences the title, it is thought by some that the interchange of two closely connected divine names is not impossible, and that this Merodach-shazzar represents Belshazzar. No trace, however, is found of a Darius reigning in Babylon after its capture by Cyrus, and we are still left to the various conflicting conjectures of scholars as to the identity of the person who bears that name in the book of Daniel.

Some discussion has lately been raised upon the character of Cyrus through the discovery of fresh records of his reign. It was long held that he was moved to favourable treatment of the Jewish captives, not merely by receiving information of the prophecies uttered respecting him, but also by some measure of sympathy which, as himself a monotheistic fire-worshipper, he may have cherished for the simple worship of Jehovah. It now appears, however, that his kindly tolerance of the Jews, and protection of themselves and their religion, was only of a piece with his general treatment of the various nationalities who came under his sway in the course of his conquests. Babylon and its gods received similar treatment at his hands. And it was surely the best policy for the founder of such an empire as his, to extend his sway over distant and various nationalities by the influence of gratitude for such complete reversal, not only of the policy of Nebuchadnezzar, but of the general tactics of conquerors.

In this and preceding articles, enough has been said to show the immense value of the researches that are being carried on among the ruins of the empires of the old world, and the interest that they have for every student of the Bible history. The Spirit-taught Israelite looked upon all the events in the history of his nation as the direct result of the will of God, the real King of Israel, and recognised His direct intervention in every deliverance as well as in every judgment. From the story written under this influence, we get but the one side of the incidents narrated—the side which bears the impress of a Divine purpose for the ends of moral and spiritual government. It did not come within the province of such historians to set forth in detail the second causes by which the facts they described were brought about; they would have obscured the spiritual purpose by overloading their narrative with outside matter such as that. But to us, the Bible, if it is to be anything at all, must in the first instance be an authentic history; that is the foundation of all our other beliefs concerning it. And the correspondence we have sought to trace between the successive phases of Israel's history and the political circumstances of the nations that exercised most influence upon it, has no unimportant part in giving the Scripture narrative a firm foundation upon the actual soil of this world, from which it may rise to the heavenly heights with which it claims to hold converse.

ANDREW MELVILLE.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

NOTES OF THE DAY.

THE RECENT MEETING OF COUNCIL.

NOTWITHSTANDING the inevitable repetition, to some extent, of what has been already given, it has been deemed advisable to present a complete and connected list of the various Churches forming the General Presbyterian Alliance, together with the names of their representatives at the recent meeting in Philadelphia, as well as the order of business and the subjects discussed.

ROLL OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

23rd September to 3rd October, 1880.

DIVISION I.—CONTINENT OF EUROPE.

BOHEMIA.—*Evangelical Reformed Church.*

Rev. Justus Emmanuel Szalatnay, Velim.

BELGIUM.—*Union of Evangelical Congregations. Missionary Christian Church.*

Rev. Leonard Anet, Brussels.

FRANCE.—*National Reformed Church.*

Rev. Adolphe Monod, Carcassonne, Aude.

GERMANY.—*Free Evangelical Church of Germany.*

Rev. H. Rother, Görlitz.

*Old Reformed Church of East Friesland.*ITALY.—*Waldensian Church.*

Rev. Professor Emilio Comba, Florence.

Free Church.

Rev. Antonio Arrighi.

Rev. Professor Henderson, Rome.

NETHERLANDS.—*Reformed Church.*" —*Christian Reformed (Free) Church.*SPAIN.—*Spanish Christian Church.*

(Stated Clerk—Don Manrique Alonso, Correduria 48, Seville.)

Rev. John Jameson, Madrid.

SWITZERLAND.

BERNE.—*French Church.*NEUCHÂTEL.—*Evangelical Church of Neuchâtel, independent of the State.*VAUD, *Reformed Church of the Canton de.*" *Free Church of the Canton de.*

DIVISION II.—UNITED KINGDOM.

ENGLAND.—*Presbyterian Church.*

(Stated Clerk—Rev. William M'Caw, Manchester.)

Rev. Alexander Macleod, D.D., Birkenhead.

Rev. Professor William Graham, D.D., London.

Rev. H. L. MacKenzie, M.A., Swatow, China.

IRELAND.—*Presbyterian Church.*(Stated Clerk—Rev. John H. Orr, Antrim.)
Rev. Professor Robert Watts, D.D., Belfast.

Rev. J. S. Hamilton, M.A., Banbridge.

Rev. Robert Knox, D.D., Belfast.

Rev. James M. Rodgers, Derry.

Rev. John S. M'Intosh, M.A., Belfast.

Rev. Robert M'Cheyne Edgar, M.A., Dublin.

Rev. James C. Ferris, Newry.

Rev. S. J. Hanson, Kingstown.

Rev. Jonathan Simpson, Portrush.

Rev. Edward F. Simpson, Ballymena.

John Hanson, Esq., Antrim.

Reformed Presbyterian Church.

(Stated Clerk—Rev. Robert Nevin, Londonderry.)

Rev. James Brown, Ballymoney.

Rev. William J. Maxwell, M.A., Liverpool.

SCOTLAND, *Church of.*

(Stated Clerk—Rev. Principal Tulloch, D.D., St. Andrews.)

Rev. Professor Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Rev. Professor Alex. F. Mitchell, D.D.,
St. Andrews.
Rev. John Rankine, D.D., Sorn.
Rev. Donald McLeod, B.A., Jedburgh.
Rev. John Marshall Lang, D.D., Glasgow.
Rev. James Dodds, D.D., Glasgow.
Rev. Henry Wallis Smith, Kirknewton.
Rev. C. M. Grant, B.D., Dundee.
Rev. John Struthers, LL.D., Prestonpans.
Rev. Thomas Slater, Demerara.
A. T. Niven, Esq., C.A., Edinburgh.
And. H. Graham, Esq., Glasgow.
William John Menzies, Esq., W.S., Edinburgh.
William Graham, Esq., C.A., Glasgow.
Colin McKenzie, Esq., W.S., Edinburgh.
John Neilson Cuthbertson, Esq., Glasgow.

Free Church.

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. Sir Henry W. Moncreiff, Bart., D.D., Edinburgh.)
Rev. Thomas Main, D.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. Principal Robert Rainy, D.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. Professor William G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. Professor Alexander B. Bruce, D.D., Glasgow.
Rev. Edward A. Thomson, Edinburgh.
Rev. D. D. Bannerman, M.A., Perth.
Rev. Robert Howie, M.A., Glasgow.
Rev. William H. Goold, D.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. Alexander Mackenzie, M.A., Edinburgh.
Rev. J. Murray Mitchell, LL.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. William Welsh, Broughton.
Rev. Narayan Sheshadri, India.
Francis Brown Douglas, Esq., Edinburgh.
William Henderson, Esq., Aberdeen.
George Smith, Esq., LL.D., Edinburgh.
Edmund Archibald Stuart-Gray, Esq., Perthshire.

James Duncan Smith, Esq., S.S.C.,
Edinburgh.
James Macdonald, Esq., W.S., Edinburgh.
John MacGregor McCandlish, Esq., W.S.,
Edinburgh.
James Macnee, Esq., M.D., Inverness.

United Presbyterian Church.

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. William Wood,
Campsie.)

Rev. Professor Henry Calderwood, LL.D.,
Edinburgh.
Rev. Principal John Cairns, D.D., Edinburgh.
Rev. George C. Hutton, D.D., Paisley.
Rev. William Wood, Campsie.
Rev. James Wardrop, D.D., West Calder.
Rev. John Stark, Duntocher.
Rev. John Hutchison, D.D., Bonnington.
Rev. George Robson, Inverness.
Rev. George F. James, Edinburgh.
Rev. William Douglas Moffat, Edinburgh.
Rev. John Ruthven, Kinross.
David Corsar, Esq., Arbroath.
William Anderson, Esq., Edinburgh.
James Thin, Esq., Edinburgh.
Thos. Finlayson, Esq., Bonnington.
W. Lyon, Esq., Edinburgh.

Reformed Presbyterian Church.

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. J. Kerr, Greenock.)

Original Secession Church.

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. W. B. Gardiner,
Pollokshaws.)

WALES.—*Calvinistic Methodist Church in
Wales and in the United States.*

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. Thomas Jones Wheldon,
Conway, North Wales.)

Rev. William Roberts, D.D., Utica, U.S.
Rev. Rees Evans, Cambria, Wis.
Rev. David Harries, Chicago, Ill.
Uriah Davies, Esq., Columbus, Wis.

DIVISION III.—UNITED STATES.

UNITED STATES.—*Presbyterian Church in
the United States (North).*

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. E. F. Hatfield, D.D.,
New York City.)

Rev. William P. Breed, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Charles A. Dickey, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. S. Ireneus Prime, D.D., New York City.
Rev. Samuel J. Nicolls, D.D., St. Louis, Mo.
Rev. John Hall, D.D., New York City.
Rev. Thomas S. Hastings, D.D., New York City.
Rev. Henry A. Nelson, D.D., Geneva, N.Y.

Rev. Wm. H. Green, D.D., LL.D.,
Princeton, N. J.
Rev. Villeroy D. Reed, D.D., Camden,
N.J.
Rev. James B. Shaw, D.D., Rochester,
N.Y.
Rev. William M. Paxton, D.D., New
York City.
Rev. George W. Musgrave, D.D., LL.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Thomas J. Shepherd, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Joseph T. Smith, D.D., Baltimore,
Md.
Rev. James I. Brownson, D.D., Wash-
ington, Pa.
Rev. John C. Lowrie, D.D., New York
City.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Rev. Arthur Mitchell, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
 Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, D.D., Detroit, Mich.
 Rev. Aaron L. Lindsley, D.D., Portland, Oregon.
 George Junkin, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Robert N. Wilson, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, New York City.
 Hon. Horace Maynard, Postmaster-General, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.
 Hon. Chauncey N. Olds, LL.D., Columbus, Ohio.
 Hon. W. Strong, LL.D., Justice, Supreme Court, U.S.A., Washington, D.C.
 Hon. Thomas W. Ferry, Ex-President of the Senate, U.S.A., Michigan.
 His Excellency Gen. Geo. B. McLellan, LL.D., Governor of the State of New Jersey, Orange, N.J.
 Professor Stephen Alexander, LL.D., Princeton, N.J.
 Henry Day, Esq., New York City.
 Hon. Stanley Mathews, LL.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Hon. Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Hon. James Richardson, St. Louis, Mo.
 Hovey K. Clarke, Esq., Detroit, Mich.
 Professor Ormond Beatty, LL.D., Danville, Ky.
 T. Charleton Henry, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hon. Joseph Allison, LL.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Prof. Theodore Dwight, LL.D., New York City.
 Geo. S. Drake, Esq., St. Louis, Mo.
 Henry Ivison, Esq., New York City.

Presbyterian Church in the United States (South).

(Stated Clerk—Rev. J. R. Wilson, D.D., Wilmington, N.C.)

Rev. Joseph B. Stratton, D.D., Natchez, Miss.
 Rev. M. H. Houston, Taylorville, Ky.
 Rev. Henry M. Scudder, D.D., Ebenezer, Ky.
 Rev. Charles A. Stillman, D.D., Tuska-loosa, Ala.
 Rev. John Leighton Wilson, D.D., Baltimore, Md.
 Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D.D., Wilmington, N.C.
 Rev. James A. Lefevre, D.D., Baltimore, Md.
 Rev. Allen Wright, Choctaw Nation.
 Rev. George D. Armstrong, D.D., Norfolk, Va.
 Rev. William U. Murkland, D.D., Baltimore, Md.
 Rev. William E. Boggs, D.D., Atlanta, Ga.

Rev. William Brown, D.D., Fredericksburg, Va.
 Rev. Charles H. Read, D.D., Richmond, Va.
 Rev. Jacob Henry Smith, D.D., Greensboro, N.C.
 Hon. John L. Marye, Fredericksburg, Va.
 Judge Thomas Thompson, South Carolina.
 William P. Webb, Esq., Eutaw, Ala.
 William M. McPheeters, Esq., M.D., St. Louis, Mo.
 Hon. Isaac D. Jones, Baltimore, Md.
 Hon. Thomas A. Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
 Patrick Joyce, Esq., Louisville, Ky.
 Professor W. C. Kerr, North Carolina.
 D. C. Anderson, Esq., Mo., Ala.
 Professor Charles S. Venable, LL.D., Charlottesville, Va.
 Hon. C. B. Moore, Little Rock, Ark.
 Judge James M. Baker, Jacksonville, Fla.
 J. J. Gresham, Esq., Macon, Ga.
 A. P. McCormack, Esq., Fla.

Reformed Church in America.

(Stated Clerk—Rev. P. D. Van Cleef, D.D., Jersey City, N.J.)

Rev. Abraham R. Van Nest, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rev. J. R. Taylor, D.D., Newark, N.J.
 Rev. Aemon P. Van Gieson, D.D., Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
 Rev. Joachim Elmendorf, D.D., Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
 Rev. John Thomson, D.D., Catskill, N.Y.
 Rev. Philip Phelps, Jr., D.D., Holland, Mich.
 William H. Campbell, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.
 Daniel S. Jones, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hon. Samuel Sloan, New York City.
 William Bogardus, Esq., New York City.
 Hon. Peter S. Danforth, Schoharie, N.Y.
 Hon. Robert H. Pruyn, Albany, N.Y.

Reformed Church in the United States of North America.

(Stated Clerk—Rev. Isaac H. Reiter, D.D., Dayton, Ohio.)

Rev. Thomas C. Porter, D.D., LL.D., Easton, Pa.
 Rev. John H. A. Bomberger, D.D., Collegeville, Pa.
 Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.
 Rev. Franklin W. Kremer, D.D., Lebanon, Pa.
 Rev. D. Earnest Klopp, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rev. Geo. W. Williard, D.D., Tiffin, Ohio.
 Rev. Scott F. Hershey, Denver, Ind.
 Rev. F. W. Berlemann, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rev. Jacob H. Dahlman, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Rev. John M. Titzel, Altoona, Pa.
 Rev. Thomas J. Barkley, Sunbury, Pa.
 Rev. Jacob O. Miller, D.D., York, Pa.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Rev. George W. Glessner, D.D., Ship-
pensburg, Pa.
Rev. Nicholas Gehr, D.D., Philadel-
phia, Pa.
Rev. John F. Bousche, New York City.
Jacob Rader, Esq., Easton, Pa.
Thos. W. Chapman, Esq., Navarre, Ohio.
Henry Tons, Esq., Fort Wayne, Ind.
Christian M. Bousch, Esq., Meadville, Pa.
John P. Reeds, Esq., Bedford, Pa.

*United Presbyterian Church of North
America.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. Wm. J. Reid, D.D.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Rev. President E. T. Jeffers, D.D., New
Wilmington, Pa.
Rev. W. H. M'Millan, D.D., Allegheny, Pa.
Rev. President David Paul, D.D., New
Concord, Ohio.
Rev. Professor William Bruce, D.D.,
Xenia, Ohio.
Rev. Professor D. R. Kerr, D.D., Pitts-
burgh, Pa.
Rev. J. B. Dales, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. D. A. Wallace, D.D., LL.D., Woos-
ter, Ohio.
Rev. Jas. Brown, D.D., Columbus City,
Iowa.
Rev. John Comin, D.D., Rix Mills, Ohio.
General D. W. Houston, Garnet, Kansas.
Hon. James Dawson, Washington, Iowa.

Professor E. F. Reid, Monmouth, Ill.
S. B. Clark, Esq., M.D., Cambridge, Ohio.
Thomas M'Cance, Esq., Pittsburgh, Pa.
James M'Candles, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.
W. K. Carson, Esq., Baltimore, Md.

Associated Reformed Synod of the South.

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. James Boyce, D.D.,
Due West, S.C.)

Rev. James Boyce, D.D., Due West, S.C.
Rev. J. T. Bonner, D.D., Due West, S.C.
Hon. C. B. Simonton, Covington, Tenn.

*General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian
Church.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. David Steele, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.)

Rev. David Steele, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Alexander Kerr, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa.

*Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church
in America.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. T. P. Stevenson, D.D.,
Philadelphia, Pa.)

Rev. A. M. Milligan, D.D., Pittsburgh,
Pa.
Rev. T. P. Stevenson, D.D., Philadel-
phia, Pa.
William Neely, Esq., New York City.
Samuel A. Sterrett, Esq., M.D., Pitts-
burgh, Pa.

DIVISION IV.—BRITISH COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES.

CANADA.—*Presbyterian Church.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. William Reid, D.D.,
Toronto.)

Rev. Donald Macrae, M.A., B.D., St.
John's, N.B.
Rev. Principal A. M'Knight, D.D.,
Halifax, N.S.
Rev. Principal D. H. M'Vicar, LL.D.,
Montreal.
Rev. Principal G. M. Grant, D.D.,
Kingston.
Rev. Principal William Caven, D.D.,
Toronto.
Rev. William Reid, D.D., Toronto.
Rev. John Jenkins, D.D., LL.D., Mon-
treal.
Rev. Robert F. Burns, D.D., Halifax, N.S.
Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, B.D., Toronto.
Rev. George D. Mathews, D.D., Quebec.
T. W. Taylor, Esq., M.A., Master in
Chancery, Toronto.
Hon. Alexander Morris, D.C.L., Toronto.
James Croil, Esq., Montreal.
Hon. John M'Murich, Toronto.
J. D. Macdonald, Esq., M.D., Hamilton.
Thomas M'Crae, Esq., Guelph.
J. B. Fairbairn, Esq., Ottawa.
James K. Blair, Esq., Truro, N.S.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.—*Dutch Reformed
Church in South Africa.*

Rev. Professor Nicholas Hofmeyr,
Stellenbosch.
Rev. John Albertyn, Middleburg.

CEYLON.—*Presbytery of Ceylon.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. Henry Mitchell,
Galle, Ceylon.)

William Smith, Esq., Kandy, Ceylon.

NATAL.—*Dutch Reformed Church.*

Presbytery of Natal.
*Christian Reformed Church, South
Africa.*

NEW HEBRIDES, *Mission Synod of.*

Rev. Thomas Nelson.

NEW SOUTH WALES.—*Presbyterian Church.*

(*Stated Clerk*)—Rev. James S. Laing,
Musswellbrook, N.S.W.)

Rev. Principal John Kinross, B.A.,
Sydney.

NEW ZEALAND.—*Presbyterian Church.*

ORANGE FREE STATE.—*Dutch Reformed
Church.*

OTAGO AND SOUTHLAND.—*Presbyterian
Church.*

PROGRAMME OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL. 385

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

QUEENSLAND.—*Presbyterian Church.*

WESTERN AUSTRALIA, *Synod of.*

SOUTH AUSTRALIA, *Presbytery of.*

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. David Paton.)

Rev. James Henderson, Adelaide.

TASMANIA, *Presbyterian Church of.*

(*Stated Clerk*—Rev. James Scott,
Hobart Town.)

Rev. Robert S. Duff, M.A., Evandale.

VICTORIA, *Presbyterian Church of.*

Rev. James Nish, Sandhurst.

Thomas Baillie, Esq., Melbourne.

Francis Ormond, Esq., Melbourne.

LIST OF THE GENTLEMEN THAT THE COUNCIL INVITED TO SIT WITH THEM DURING THEIR SESSION.

Benjamin L. Agnew, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
Lyman H. Atwater, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N.J.

W. W. Barr, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. S. M. Breckenridge, St. Louis, Missouri.

Rev. A. F. Buscarlet, Lausanne.

William H. Campbell, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.

T. W. Chambers, D.D., New York City.

Rev. C. Chiniquy, Kankakee, Ills.

Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn, N.Y.

John De Witt, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

Hon. Chief-Justice C. D. Drake, Washington, D.C.

Jonathan Edwards, D.D., LL.D., Danville, Kentucky.

Rev. O. Erdman, Elberfeld, Germany.

George Fisch, D.D., Paris, France.

Rev. Fritz Fliedner, Madrid, Spain.

Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, St. Louis, Mo.

William Gregg, D.D., Toronto, Canada.

Edwin F. Hatfield, D.D., New York City.

Hiram C. Haydn, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.

Leroy J. Halsey, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D., New York City.

A. A. Hodge, D.D., Princeton, N.J.

E. P. Humphrey, D.D., LL.D., Louisville, Kentucky.

Herrick Johnson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

Wilhelm Krafft, D.D., Bonn, Germany.

Robert Lewis, Esq., New York City.

Herrman Krumacher, D.D., Stettin, Germany.

Rev. A. Mabille, Basutoland, South Africa.

G. A. Matile, Esq., D.C.L., Washington, D.C.

James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N.J.

Edward D. Morris, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.

William Ormiston, D.D., New York City.

R. M. Patterson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

H. G. Pfeleiderer, D.D., Kornthal, Germany.

Edmond de Pressensé, D.D., Paris, France.

William J. Reid, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.

William Roberts, D.D., Utica, N.Y.

Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., New York City.

Sylvester F. Scovel, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rev. Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D.D., Allegheny, Pa.

A. B. Van Zandt, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.

J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., Utrecht, Holland.

Samuel J. Wilson, D.D., LL.D., Allegheny, Pa.

T. D. Witherspoon, D.D., Petersburg, Va.

Rev. S. O. Wylie, Philadelphia, Pa.

CLERKS OF THE COUNCIL.

Rev. Wm. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D.

Rev. G. D. Mathews, D.D.

ASSISTANT CLERK.

Rev. Matthew Newkirk.

PROGRAMME OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL.

Thursday, 23rd September.

11 A.M.—Academy of Music. Opening Sermon by Rev. William M. Paxton, D.D., of New York City.

3 P.M.—Horticultural Hall. Business Meeting. Address of Welcome by Wm. P. Breed, D.D., of Philadelphia, Pa. Organisation.

Report of Committee on *Statistics*. Prof. Wm. G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh, Chairman.

7.30 P.M.—“The Ceremonial, the Moral, and the Emotional in Christian Life and Worship,” Prof. Roswell D. Hitchcock, D.D., LL.D., New York City.

“Modern theological thought,” Principal Robert Rainy, D.D., of Edinburgh.

“Religion in secular affairs,” Principal G. M. Grant, D.D., Kingston, Canada.

VOL. IV.—NO. XXIII.

2 c

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Friday, 24th September.

9.30 A.M.—“Inspiration, Authenticity, and Interpretation of the Scriptures,” Prof. E. P. Humphrey, D.D., LL.D., Louisville, Ky.; Prof. Robert Watts, D.D., Belfast.

2.30 P.M.—“Distinctive principles of Presbyterianism,” Prof. Samuel J. Wilson, D.D., LL.D., Allegheny City, Pa. “Worship of the Reformed Churches,” John De Witt, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

“Ruling Elders,” C. H. Read, D.D., Richmond, Va.

7.30 P.M.—“The Divine in men’s lives,” Rev. Professor Wm. Graham, D.D., London.

“The application of the Gospel to employers and employed,” William G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh.

“Christianity, the friend of the working classes,” Hon. Chief Justice C. D. Drake, Washington, D.C.

Saturday, 25th September.

9.30 A.M.—“Revealed religion in its relation to science and philosophy: Forms of modern Infidelity.” “The relations of science and theology,” Prof. Henry Calderwood, LL.D., Edinburgh. “How to deal with young men trained in Science, in this age of unsettled opinion,” President James M’Cosh, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N.J.

2.30 P.M.—Forenoon subject continued. “Apologetics,” Ed. de Pressensé, D.D., Paris (*Paper*). “Agnosticism,” Prof. Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D., Edinburgh.

7.30 P.M.—Reception given to the Delegates by the Board of Publication in their building on Chestnut Street, which has been placed at the disposal of the Council during its sessions.

Monday, 27th September.

9.30 A.M.—Report of Committee on *Creeds and Confessions*. Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., New York, Chairman; A. B. Van Zandt, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.

“Bible Revision,” T. W. Chambers, D.D., New York City. “Presbyterianism and Education,” Prof. Edward D. Morris, D.D., Cincinnati, O.

2.30 P.M.—“Religion and Education in New South Wales,” Rev. Principal Kinross, Sydney.

“Presbyterianism in relation to civil and religious Liberty,” Sylvester F. Scovel, Pittsburgh, Pa. “Religion and Politics,” Prof. Lyman H. Atwater, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N.J.

7.30 P.M.—“Presbyterian Catholicity,” George C. Hutton, D.D., Paisley, Principal D. H. Macvicar, LL.D., Montreal; Wm. H. Campbell, D.D., New Brunswick, N.J.

Tuesday, 28th September.

9.30 A.M.—“The Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ,” Principal John Cairns, D.D., Edinburgh; Prof. A. A. Hedge, D.D., Princeton, N.J.

“Future Retribution,” T. D. Witherspoon, D.D., Petersburg, Va.

2.30 P.M.—“Church Extension in large cities,” R. M. Patterson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Wm. J. R. Taylor, D.D., Newark, N.J.

“Church Extension in sparsely settled districts,” W. J. Reid, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa. “The Evangelisation of Ireland,” Robert Knox, D.D., Belfast.

7.30 P.M.—“Sabbath Schools; their use and abuse,” Arthur Mitchell, D.D., Chicago, Ill. “The Children’s portion in the Sabbath service,” Alexander Macleod, D.D., Birkenhead.

“Evangelists and Evangelistic Work;” “Recent Evangelistic Work in Paris,” George Fisch, D.D., Paris (*Paper*). Joseph R. Wilson, D.D., Wilmington, N.C.

PROGRAMME OF THE PRESBYTERIAN COUNCIL. 387

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Wednesday, 29th September.

9.30 A.M.—“The Theology of the Reformed Church;” “The Conflict between Faith and Rationalism in Holland,” Prof. J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., Utrecht (*Paper*). “The Theology of the Reformed Church, with special reference to the Westminster Standards,” Prof. Alex. Mitchell, D.D., St. Andrews. “The Theology of the German Reformed Church,” Prof. Thomas G. Apple, D.D., Lancaster, Pa.

2.30 P.M.—“Grounds and methods of admission to Sealing Ordinances,” Rev. D. D. Bannerman, M.A., Perth. “Baptism,” T. P. Stevenson, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

“Church Discipline; its province and use,” Prof. Jonathan Edwards, D.D., LL.D., Danville, Ky.; “Regeneration,” Prof. J. H. A. Bomberger, Ursinus College, Pa.

7.30 P.M.—(Academy of Music)—“Sabbath Observance,” Prof. William Gregg, D.D., Toronto; Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, St. Louis, Mo.

“Temperance,” Hon. William E. Dodge, New York City.

“Popular Amusements,” Theodore L. Cuyler, D.D., Brooklyn, N.Y.

Thursday, 30th September.

9.30 A.M.—Report of Committee on *Foreign Mission Work*, Wm. M. Paxton, D.D., New York City; J. Murray Mitchell, LL.D., Edinburgh, Joint-Chairmen; J. Leighton Wilson, D.D., Baltimore, Md. “Co-operation among Missionaries;” A Communication from the U.P. Church of Scotland, John C. Lowrie, D.D., New York City.

2.30 P.M.—“The proper care, support, and training of Candidates for the Ministry,” Herrick Johnson, D.D., Chicago, Ill. “Church Order and Church Life,” J. Marshall Lang, D.D., Glasgow. “The world’s demand for Ministers:” a communication from the U.P. Church of Scotland.

“Systematic Beneficence,” Hiram C. Haydn, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio. “Christian Beneficence,” W. W. Barr, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

“Ministerial Support,” Benjamin L. Agnew, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

7.30 P.M.—Reports on the state of religion in heathen countries. India; Liberia; South Africa, Rev. A. Mabile, Basutoland.

Friday, 1st October.

9.30 A.M.—Report of Committee on *Modes of helping the Churches of the European Continent*; J. A. Campbell, Esq., LL.D., Glasgow, and David MacLagan, Esq., Edinburgh, Joint-Chairmen. Our relations to the Churches of the European Continent; Rev. J. S. McIntosh, Belfast. Reports on the state of religion in France, Rev. Adolphe Monod, Carcassonne, Aude; Switzerland, Rev. A. F. Buscarlet, Lausanne; Moravia, Rev. Ferdinand Cizar, Klobouk (*Paper*). Letter from the National Evangelical Union of Geneva.

2.30 P.M.—Report of Committee on *Desiderata of Presbyterian History*; Alex. Mitchell, D.D., St. Andrews, Chairman. Diffusion of Presbyterian Literature; Wm. P. Breed, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa. Church Work in Australia.

“Revivals of Religion,” Edwin F. Hatfield, D.D., New York City.

“Personal Religion,” Prof. David Steele, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.

7.30 P.M.—(Academy of Music)—Reports on state of religion in—1. Bohemia; Rev. Justus Em. Szalatnay, Velim. 2. Spain; Rev. Fritz Fliedner, Madrid. 3. Italy; Prof. Emilio Comba, Florence. 4. Belgium: Romanism and the School question; Rev. Leonard Anet, Brussels.

Saturday, 2nd October.

10 A.M.—(Horticultural Hall)—Miscellaneous Business.

1 P.M.—Farewell meeting of the Council, with Parting Address by Rev. Charles A. Dickey, D.D.

GENERAL SURVEY.

ENGLAND.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

ON Tuesday, the 28th of September, the "Church Congress" assembled at Leicester, where it created the most lively interest. The old city—strongly Dissenting though it is—gave a hearty welcome to the visitors. The Town Council put up a large temporary structure for their accommodation. At the great conversazione given in the Museum by the Mayor—himself a Congregationalist—the Dissenting clergy presented a generous and manly address of welcome, which was cordially responded to by the President of the Congress, the Bishop of Peterborough, with more than his usual eloquence. The attendance was very large.

A series of notable papers was read on the "Religious Condition of the Nation." The first was by Canon Barry, on religion among the upper classes. There is, he thinks, a great amount of upper-class infidelity; both in the form of arrogant dogmatism, contemptuous of all religion, and in the form of an easy-going Paganism, which worships the beauties and comforts of civilisation, and pays small regard to the old-fashioned decencies and proprieties of life. "It is eminently," says Canon Barry, "an era of religious conflict in the upper regions of English society."

Mr. Lefroy, in an energetic paper, tells a very different tale of the state of religion in the middle ranks. If religious doubts find their way even there, through literary periodicals and otherwise, it is not to any serious extent. The terrible *isms*, which are agonising and desolating above them, have not much influence among our mercantile and trading classes, which, indeed, have in them the religious might of the nation. Not that all is here as it should be. The haste to be rich produces a certain amount of moral laxity. But Mr. Lefroy asserts that "sharp practice is scouted by the Liverpool merchants, than whom a more generous and high-minded class is not within the shores of England."

The Rector of St. George's in the East (London), and the Bishop of Bedford, a London suffragan, speak of the industrial classes. Mr. Jones' testimony is that they have generally abandoned the Church. "If we analyse congregations," he says, "whether in church or in chapel, the industrial constituent is discovered to be minutely small." It is not that there is any great amount of positive unbelief, but just that the Church, as it is, has no attraction. Mr. Jones thinks that there is much honesty, truthfulness, kindness, a great love of fairness and tolerance, in fact, "a widely diffused atmosphere of Christianity" among working-people in London, though, like "some upper sections of society," they too easily tolerate some social and domestic faults, and many are intemperate, "like those of another class a hundred years ago."

The Bishop of Bedford gives the same report as Mr. Jones. The East London labouring classes have gone from the Church. "An exceedingly small proportion of them attend public worship." It is very much the same with "Church and Chapel." There is "not much speculative unbelief." The style of service, it is added, does not matter, but "*the preaching does.*" But the Bishop does not speak merely of towns. He gives us the result of his experience and his inquiries in the "country charge" which he held till lately. Even there, the horizon is dark enough. There is "increasing alienation" of the rural labourers from the Church of England notwithstanding its "increased efficiency." "In some quarters this is distinctly traceable to the 'Agricultural Labourers' Union.'" But even where

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

that influence is not felt, it is the same. The clergyman may be personally a favourite, the landlord may be well enough liked, but it avails little. The rural toiler is "learning independence and becoming ambitious." He is coming under "the permeating influence of democratic ideas," and he turns away from the Church of "the carriage folks." Another cause of this alienation of the English peasantry from the Church, the Bishop of Bedford thinks, is to be found in the fact that the services and the sermons of the Church are "far above their intelligent appreciation." It is different in the Dissenting Churches. To what extent, however, dissent is in a better state than the Church, the Bishop is unable to say. In regard to the district of Shropshire where he had his cure, he was only able to assure himself that the chapels had a much better proportion of male communicants than the churches, but that in both there was a great deficiency of labourer communicants.

Another series of papers had for their subject "The Church and the Poor." Dr. Chalmers was completely out-done in the strong things that were said against a legal provision for the poor, and one wonders that Mr. Pell, M.P., and Mr. Blackley made no allusion to his views. "The poor-law creates improvidence" says the Rector of Waltham, "the poor-law creates pauperism, the poor-law creates intemperance." He urges his plan of compulsory insurance as the only remedy. Mr. Stubbs, a Buckinghamshire clergyman, gave a sad account of the pauperised condition of his people. More than 70 per cent. of them are "potential paupers." There is not "a single labouring man in his parish past work who is not in the workhouse, or getting out-door relief." "In Sheffield he had heard working people assert that they would rather starve than take parish pay," but he had never once heard of such a case in Buckinghamshire.

The Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Carnarvon, and Mr. Talbot, M.P., furnished papers, and Canon Farrar made a long speech on "The influence of the three great schools of thought." They were all sufficiently vague. Strong assertions were made of the advantages accruing from the different schools: "it is the very glory and the strength of the Church of England to have them." This may be so. But one is put at one's wits' end by such a statement as that Canon Farrar and his evangelical brethren had a blessed bond "in their common reliance on the one offering for sin;" or such a congratulatory commendation as that which the President of the Church Union bestowed on the Broad men, that they had done much to put an end to Calvinism—in a Church with Calvinistic articles. Whatever the Bishop of Durham may say of the folly of trying to be creedless, does it not just come to this, that the comprehension he advocates means neither more nor less than a Church with no doctrine of the atonement, of justification, of faith, of the sacraments, of regeneration, of orders, of the future life?

On the whole, the Congress was successful, and no doubt calculated to stimulate and strengthen Church life. Yet there are aspects of it very depressing and saddening. Evangelicalism was almost nowhere. The *Rock* admits this, and seems almost to give up hope—the evil must just be submitted to, till "the coming of the Lord." It does not seem, however, that a "broad" latitudinarianism "had it all its own way." The High Church was there, and in unmistakable power; witness the papers of Mr. Berdman Compton, of the Bishop of Winchester, of Canon Farrar, of Canon Temple, of Dr. Gott, &c. The truth is, that on the one hand High-Churchism is lax in doctrine, and on the other, Broad-Churchism has no great repugnance to sacerdotalism with its rites and ceremonies, if not too exclusive and intolerant. Might it not be said that the Broad and the High in the Anglican Church have their common origin, historically, in Laud?

The "Grahamstown case" has been decided against Bishop Merriman. The Anglican Church of Cape Colony is declared to be not a part of the Church of England. "It is separated from it, root and branch." A legal claim has already been made to the Grahamstown "Bishopric Endowment Fund." Bishop Colenso is the only legal Episcopal representative of the Church of England in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

South Africa, and he has now a hard-headed coadjutor in Dean Williams. An appeal has been taken to the Privy Council.

NONCONFORMISTS.

The Baptist Union commenced its Autumn Meetings in London, on Monday, the 4th October. There was a large meeting that evening in the Metropolitan Tabernacle to bid farewell to a number of missionaries about to leave for their fields of labour in foreign lands—two of them, Mr. Evans and Mr. Barnett, being new men.

On Tuesday, there was an important conference on Foreign Missions in Bloomsbury Chapel, which was "crowded with delegates and friends." First of all there was read a paper of Mr. Bompas, Q.C.; its subject was "Missionary organisation in Church and School." Then followed Dr. Landels, on "Missionary Consecration: are present contributions adequate to the work?" He was animated and rousing. He denounced "the prevailing stinginess as a mere mockery of God." He objected strongly to some of the methods in use for keeping up the funds. "Methods avoiding self-sacrifice were to be set aside as coming from the devil." After the papers, various suggestions were made. Epitomised biographies of missionary heroes should be circulated. Large and clear maps of the mission-fields should be put into the hands of the ministers. Surely, said a layman, there are a hundred congregations that could each support a missionary, over and above what they were already doing. He would undertake for the small society with which he was connected. Mr. Barran, M.P. for Leeds, intimated that in addition to his present yearly contribution, he would "be good for half a missionary" (£175).

After the Conference, a Missionary Meeting was held in Exeter Hall, which was "crowded." Among other interesting speeches was one by Mr. Wall, a Baptist minister at Rome. He mentioned that he himself had baptised three hundred Roman artisans, converts from Popery. Among other converts he mentioned a Romish priest who had at one time been put under penance for giving the Sacrament to the present Queen of Italy, and who had for some years preached the Gospel in a chapel which was built for him.

SCOTLAND.

SCOTCH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

THE Home Mission of the Established Church is carried on with vigour. Last year it gave between four and five thousand pounds to 130 mission churches and stations. In 1879, seven churches were also endowed.

Matters seem to prosper at Blantyre. Dr. Peddie, a medical missionary appointed by the Church, has arrived there. He and Mr. Macdonald have been planning a new station. Dr. Rankin and his companions were expected to arrive in August. Unhappily, as we learn from the public papers, the Consul at Zanzibar was unable to accompany them.

The discussion in the Presbytery of Glasgow, to which we referred in our last number, was resumed on the 6th of October. Two of the "sermons by ministers of the Established Church," to which so much attention has been directed, are by Mr. Macfarlan, minister of Lenzie, near the western capital. One of these sermons is on the text, "Prove all things;" the other has for its title, "The things which cannot be shaken." The Rev. Dr. Jamieson, a venerable and distinguished minister of the Church, criticised both in a lengthened speech, and moved, "That the Presbytery, having their attention directed to a volume entitled 'Scotch Sermons,' now produced and laid on the table, two of which are contributed by a member of this court, appoint a committee to examine the same, and report to an early meeting." The Rev. F. L. Robertson, also an able and well-known

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

minister of the Established Church, disapproved of Dr. Jamieson's motion. While strongly disclaiming sympathy with the volume as a whole, he did not believe that it represented the teaching of the "Broad Church Party within the Church." Mr. Macfarlan's sermons pained him, but still they seemed capable of an interpretation more accordant with orthodoxy than that which Dr. Jamieson put on them. He thought that all the Presbytery were called on to do was, whilst expressing their "regret at the publication of the sermons" as "liable to be misunderstood," to enjoin on the writer "the exercise of greater caution and prudence in handling the truth, so as not to disquiet the minds of the people." Both motions were objected to. A third was proposed. Finally, it was resolved to adjourn the Presbytery for a week. And then, after another warm and earnest discussion, there was a further adjournment. At a later meeting of the Presbytery, after several amendments had been proposed and seconded, the motion of Dr. Jamieson became the finding of the Court.

The Highlands and Islands form a very important sphere of Free Church Home missionary effort. It spends, we are told, £5000 annually in supporting preaching stations, in following with Gospel ordinances the Highland fishermen to their summer resorts, in training young men for the Gaelic ministry, and in helping the ministers of large and widely-scattered congregations to obtain and support catechists.

There is intelligence from Livingstonia. The death of Mr. Gunn, a missionary artisan, is a great loss to the mission. Mr. Gunn seems to have been an earnest and thoroughgoing man. Very interesting were the manifestations made by the savage people in connection with the sad event. Soon after daybreak, on the day succeeding the death, three or four hundred of them made their appearance before the mission-houses, and must have presented a touching and picturesque sight, sitting there with their hands upon their mouths in token of their sorrow and sympathy. It is sometimes said by the enemies of missions that now-a-days there is little sacrifice in a missionary's life. A few months on the shores of Nyassa would make them think very differently. Here are some notes from a recent journal of Dr. Laws:—"19th April.—Mrs. Laws has been laid aside a week with fever. 22nd April.—In the evening I had to be down with fever. 24th April.—Had a return of fever. 28th April.—Mr. Reid had a slight attack of fever." All this beside the fresh grave of a dear brother, upon whom came the malady on Tuesday, and before Thursday was out, he had passed away.

In connection with the United Presbyterian Church, the Rev. H. Goldie, Mrs. Goldie, and Miss Slessock have just left for Calabar. There are good news from China. At one of the missions there, thirty-five adult baptisms have taken place during the year. Things have greatly altered for the better in Corea. A few years ago, the Coreans seemed altogether inaccessible; their literary men would give no aid in the acquisition of their language; but during the past year, four literary men have embraced Christianity and been baptised. Some are inquiring, and there is now no want of aid in accomplishing literary work for the mission.

The United Presbyterians propose to make a strong effort this winter to increase their contributions for foreign missions.

BELGIUM.

THE BELGIAN CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY CHURCH.

By REV. KENNEDY ANET, *Pastor at Jumet.*

It is not one of the smallest proofs of the development of the work of God in Belgium that there now exist several congregations numerous enough to be able to offer hospitality to the Synod. Formerly, our Synod was forced to meet every year in Brussels, the metropolis. For several years past it has travelled from place to place in the provinces, though without neglecting to accept sometimes the hospi-

talities of that congregation which formerly was alone in a position to receive it. This year the Synod assembled at Nessouvaux, in a lovely valley of the province of Liège, the Belgian Switzerland. A most cordial reception was given by this congregation.

One of the things which we most appreciate in our Synods is the presence of brethren from other countries. Their exhortations and their words of sympathy are for us a precious encouragement. This year we had the privilege of having amongst us, and of hearing in the meetings of the Synod and the public meetings, Colonel A. G. Young, delegate from the Free Church of Scotland and the Scottish Bible Society; the Rev. R. H. Lundie, delegate of the English Presbyterian Church; Messrs. A. Brummelkamp and S. van Velzen, professors in the Faculty of Theology of Kampen, delegates from the Christian Reformed Church in Holland; the Rev. Herr Neviandt, delegate of the Free Church of Elberfeld and Barmen, and of the "Brüderverein." Other societies and churches, which were not able to send representatives, wrote letters of sympathy to the Synod.

Our Synods are composed of members of the Ruling Committee, pastors, and one delegate from each regularly constituted congregation; they number about forty members. They are therefore very small assemblies, compared with the large Synods of Great Britain and the United States. But it must not be forgotten that thirty-three years ago our Synods had not yet come into existence; that the evangelisation of Belgium was only undertaken forty-two years since; and that twenty-six churches and stations, represented in our existing Synod, are almost wholly composed of converted Romanists.

Neither have we, in our Synods, to deal with the great questions which agitate those of our sister Churches in Great Britain and the United States. Our work consists almost exclusively in the examination of the progress of the Gospel and the employment of the funds during the past year, according to the Annual Report, about which we shall speak further on, and which is presented to the Synod by the Ruling Committee. This committee is re-elected each year, and half, at most, of its members may be chosen from pastors holding office. Among the lay-members of this year's committee, we notice a railway managing-director, a captain, two manufacturers, two engineers, and two artists; five of these laymen are Belgians. This committee presides over the work during the year. The Synod also hears the reports of the *Conseils Sectionnaires*. These bodies correspond very nearly to the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, being formed of representatives of the congregations in each province, and meeting once in three months. The Synod also examines the administration of the Council of an Orphan Asylum, and of a Provident Society for the Widows and Orphans of Pastors and Evangelists, and finally of a Committee charged with collecting the necessary funds for erecting an Asylum for the Aged; unfortunately, the amount collected up to the present date is insufficient for the foundation of this work, so necessary for the aged or infirm members of our congregations.

On examining the Annual Report which has been published, the Synod was unfortunately obliged to confirm the fact that the Central Account is burdened with a debt of £890; this deficit has been again increased since then, and now amounts to more than £1300. At the same time, the Synod had the pleasure of stating that the sum total of the usual collections made in the congregations was not inferior to that of former years. Of the £4300 received by the Central Fund, nearly half is collected among the congregations composed almost entirely of the working classes, who are frequently very poor, especially since the late industrial crisis; the rest comes from brethren, from foreign societies and churches who are kind enough to help us in carrying on the work of the evangelisation of Belgium. Is there any way of reducing our expenses? This question has often occupied our Synods, but the reply has always been in the negative. The salaries of the workers are already insufficient, and cannot therefore be reduced: the number of the labourers is too small for the work which has to be done; here again, therefore, no diminution is possible. To meet the actual need, the number ought

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

rather to be increased. Many churches, instead of one pastor, ought to have two; there is one that ought to have three. Fortunately, in all our congregations there are found laymen who are ready to help the pastors. It is thus that the nineteen pastors and evangelists (with eight Bible readers), charged with the care of the twenty-six Churches and stations (without including several other localities where regular meetings are held), are assisted by eighty lay-brethren. Many other members, who are not endowed with the instruction necessary for presiding at meetings, spend their Sunday afternoons in visiting Roman Catholic families and in distributing tracts. Moreover, all the congregations have increased; there is not one that has not, during this year, seen one or many Roman Catholics or infidels drawn towards the services. One Church saw thirteen families and nine individuals—that is to say, forty-four adults and thirty-six children—come out of the Church of Rome, and ask to be admitted as members.

We have said that the number of labourers ought to be increased in order to meet present needs; still more should it be increased for the extension of the work. Many doors are open to the Gospel. During this year, a dozen new localities have been evangelised. Everywhere we meet with a sympathetic reception: in many places we are urged to come, but are sometimes compelled to refuse, because time and strength fail us. Even in the Flemish provinces, hitherto almost inaccessible, the work seems to be developing; the Ruling Committee has just engaged, for work in Flanders, two young men, fresh from the Flemish Theological School, founded four years ago at Brussels.

One of the most interesting works is that carried on by a Bible-Reader in the lodgings of workmen, and among the brickmakers at Brussels. A great number of men, from villages six, eight, or ten leagues from the capital, come into that city to work as masons, &c. They pass the week in Brussels, and return home on Saturday evenings. They lodge in houses where twenty or thirty of them may be found together. On week-day evenings, the Bible-Reader visits these houses. After having received permission from the landlord (who rarely refuses), he holds short meetings of twenty or twenty-five minutes, during which two or three hymns are sung, a prayer offered at opening and closing, and a few verses from the Bible, accompanied by reflections and explanations, are read. In this manner he visits four or five houses each evening. "It is rarely," he writes, "that any workman makes a noise during the service; those who know how to sing join with me, and the rest listen respectfully."

Other villagers also come in great numbers during the summer to make bricks in the neighbourhood of Brussels. "It is especially," writes the Scripture Reader, "on rainy days that I assemble the brickmakers in their sheds. There are generally five or six tables together; a table consists of six persons. In five or six sheds, each one of which numbers from twelve to eighteen persons, several are provided with New Testaments and hymn-books, for they are very fond of singing. When I go there, I have to sing four or five hymns from beginning to end, before they will let me go away. I generally sing two hymns, then read a portion of the Word of God, followed by an explanation and a prayer. After this, I sing two more hymns, and distribute some tracts. Then I go on to another shed, and do likewise."

When these villagers go back to their homes, the workmen on Saturdays, the brickmakers at the end of the season, they take with them the tracts they have received, the New Testaments and Bibles they have bought, and the exhortations they have heard. Thus the Gospel is propagated, and future congregations are prepared.

Many Roman Catholics do not dare to follow the appeals of their conscience. Fear restrains them. "I believe in the resurrection, in the atonement of Jesus Christ, and in eternal life," said a gentleman to a Bible-Reader. "I know that Romanism has done nothing but demoralise the world, and that free-thought will arrive at the same result." "Then, sir," answered he, "let us shake hands, our belief is one and the same." "I give you my hand," continued the gentleman,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

"but I am not worthy to do so; for you profess your faith openly, and I have not the courage to do that." He earnestly begged the Bible-Reader to pay him another visit as soon as possible.

The excommunications hurled by the priests at those parents who send their children to the Communal schools; the violent, political, and personal sermons of the clergy; the revelations made by the Bishop of Tournai about the intrigues and the plots of the Roman Court and the Belgian Episcopacy; the dismissal of the Papal nuncio, and the discussions which this dismissal caused between the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Frère-Orban, and Cardinal Nina; the parliamentary inquiry which has just begun, and which has already revealed the evil spirit which animates the clergy;—in a word, the insupportable yoke of priestly tyranny, is gradually detaching the people from the Romish Church and preparing them to receive the Gospel. The actual position of the work of evangelisation in Belgium may therefore be summed up in three words—numerous doors open, want of labourers, and want of funds.

We do not let ourselves be discouraged, and we mean to go on with this grand work, trusting in Him "who is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all we ask or think."

GERMANY.

THE WUPPERTHAL FESTIVAL-WEEK.

THE series of anniversary meetings of divers religious societies, held every autumn in the towns in the valley of the Wupper, are always regarded with very deep interest. This year the interest in them has been greater than ever. Large crowds assembled from day to day in the different places of meeting, and, amid much in the aspects of German religious life that is fitted to discourage, the records of this festival-week are rich in the hopeful assurances they afford for the future of the kingdom of God in the Fatherland.

The proceedings began on a Saturday afternoon with the annual meeting of the *Rhenish-Westphalian Young Men's Society*. The principal subject discussed at that meeting was the place which the Bible ought to hold in the Society, and the manner in which it should be handled. Four points were insisted on as essential—(1.) That the Scriptures should be treated with the reverence due to it, and that the leaders of the "Bibelstunden" (Bible readings) should specially attend to this; (2.) That its bearings on the daily life should be made manifest; (3.) That each part should be viewed in connection with the whole; and (4.) That Christ, the central subject of the entire book, should always be placed in the foreground. On the following day, the annual sermon was preached to a crowded audience in Elberfeld. From the annual report of the Association we learn that there are now nearly 180 branch societies, with about 8000 members; of these, 75 societies specially devote themselves to Sabbath-school instruction, supplying 386 teachers for that work. There is evidence that the Spirit of God is graciously working among the youths of the district embraced by the Association, and counteracting the deadly influences of the "Zeitgeist"—unbelief and the love of pleasure. Here there are also trained up zealous labourers, prepared to put a vigorous hand to the work of home and foreign missions.

On Monday was held the annual meeting of the *Bible Society of the District of Berg*. Besides making other efforts, it aims at securing a family Bible for every family in the Rhine provinces. During the last year it circulated 6138 Bibles, and 9080 New Testaments. The report before us says, "The interesting proceedings of this meeting show that the Word of God still proves itself to be the Word of eternal life." On the following day, the *Rhenish-Westphalian Union in behalf of Israel* held their annual meeting in Gemarke. In the sermon preached on the occasion by Pastor Meyer from East Friesland, the question was discussed, How may we successfully carry on our work among the Jews? The

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

answer was—(1.) By ourselves being obedient to the Gospel of the rich grace of God in Christ Jesus, and (2.) By a constant preaching of this Gospel. It was spoken of as, in a special sense, a work of faith and hope, inasmuch as no other mission affords such sad and constant experience that Christians, by their unbelief and superstition, consciously and unconsciously, are its worst enemies. The "Jewish question," as it is called, is forcing itself on the earnest attention of the Churches. Although they form a minority of the population of Germany, yet the Jews are influencing its legislation, its press, and its whole economical development to such an extent that the question is being everywhere asked, not without alarm, "To what is all this tending?" Some hope is found in the progress and triumph of Jewish missions.

On the afternoon of the same day, there was held in Elberfeld the annual meeting of the *Evangelical Society*, which seeks, by colportage, and by lay agency in various other ways, to advance the cause of the Gospel.

The great meeting of this festival week was that of the *Rhenish Missionary Society*. It was held in the large church of Lower Barmen, which was filled to overflowing by a warmly sympathising audience. The sermon was preached by Dr. Burk, of Stuttgart, from 1 Thess. i. 2, 3. Thereafter six young men were ordained to the work of foreign missions, partly among the heathen, and partly in North America. Dr. Fabri delivered the ordination charges. The farewell address by one of the young missionaries, Hanstein, perceptibly touched the hearts of a large number of young people who were present. The report of the Society, notwithstanding a deficit of 27,000 marks in the income, was of a very encouraging kind. The congregations in the Cape Colony have undertaken to support their own schools and missions, while other congregations in the mission-field have been enabled to put forth increasing efforts toward self-support, and thus lessened the drain on the home funds. The missionary Nommensen, from Sumatra, addressed the meeting, and urged the claims of that region on the prayers and efforts of all. Dr. Schreiber gave an interesting review of the three periods in the development of missions, and was followed by Dr. Wright, from Belfast, Dr. Devust, from Barnfeld, and others. The whole tone of the addresses was encouraging and hopeful. Missionary work in the heathen field was seen to be progressing, not under any specially enthusiastic effort, but quietly and with richly blessed results.

On Thursday, the *General Church Conference* was held, when the large church of Lower Barmen was again filled. The subject of the address, which was delivered by Professor Haupt, of Kiel, was "The wisdom of Jesus in the gradual unveiling of His Person." Other speakers followed, and the theme was fully dealt with, particularly from an apologetic point of view. On the afternoon of the same day, the annual meeting of the *Rhenish-Westphalian Sabbath-School Union* was held in Elberfeld. Since 1863, when Sabbath schools were first instituted in Germany, the number of such schools has gradually increased till there are now 1466, with about 6000 teachers, and 137,500 scholars.

On Friday, there was a *Pastoral Conference*, attended only by theologians, since the questions discussed concerned them specially. The theme of the Conference was, "The dangers that beset the ministerial office." This opened up the whole subject of the responsibilities and difficulties of the office, which were dealt with by the various speakers who took part in the discussions in an earnest and practical manner. It augurs well for the interests of the cause of Christ when ministers at once "magnify" their office, and are led to cry, "Who is sufficient for these things?" In the afternoon, the *Wupperthal Tract Society* held their annual meeting in Gemarke. The sermon was preached by Pastor Walter, from Luke xvi. 1-13, and dealt with the subject of the right use of riches. This Society has long had an honoured place among the evangelistic agencies of Germany.

The concluding meetings of this great week in the valley of the Wupper were those of the *Gustavus-Adolphus Union* and of the Committee on behalf of *German Protestants in the Brazils*. Dr. Zschimmer preached an appropriate sermon on

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

the occasion, from the text, "Go ye to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The work of this most most interesting "Verein" and of the Committee is the care of the scattered brethren,—the *Diaspora*, who, but for the efforts of this association, would be beyond the reach of the means of grace.

Such a series of meetings as this is a sign of a healthful spiritual life, and cannot but serve greatly to quicken to renewed efforts, and to animate with a more hopeful spirit than ever those who are privileged to be present and to take part in them.

ITALY.

By the Rev. A. MEILLE, Florence.

THE most important event, in our Italian Protestant field, during the month of September, has undoubtedly been the annual session of the Waldensian Synod. It was opened at La Tour, on the 6th; and at the opening service five candidates for the ministry received ordination, and have since been sent to different parts of the mission-field. The Synod of this year has been fitly described by its President, the Rev. J. P. Meille, pastor of Turin, in his closing address, as a "working Synod." It was not marked by any of the so-called "important questions" which often give rise to long and animated debates, but by a thorough sifting of all the Church operations, and by some important steps taken in the reorganisation of several agencies that needed to be brought into greater harmony with the needs of our day.

The first question considered this year was that of the evangelisation of Italy. Besides the usual printed report of the Board of Evangelisation, there was read another from a committee of inquiry appointed a few weeks before to examine all that had been done during the year in that most important field. Then followed a review of all the different mission-stations and churches, in which the position, prospects, and needs of every one were carefully studied. The Board of Evangelisation came out of the ordeal with triumphant colours; and it could scarcely be otherwise, with such a devoted, experienced, and indefatigable president as the Rev. Sig. M. Prochet, of Genoa. The Board of Evangelisation received the well-deserved thanks of the Synod, "for the fidelity, the admirable regularity, and the indefatigable activity with which they have accomplished their task."

But, some one may ask, what about the results? At first sight, indeed, the progress of the Waldensian missions may appear very slow,—much slower, in fact, than Christians would desire; but if, instead of comparing one year with the year immediately preceding it, we go further back, and arrange in a table the statistics, for example, of 1860, 1870, and 1880, we shall be fully persuaded that the little seed is fast becoming a large tree. Here they are, taken from the report of the *Eglise Libre* :—

	1860.	1870.	1880.
Constituted Churches,	—	—	40
Missionary Stations,	14	20	34
Places visited,	?	?	100
Pastors,	10	20	34
Evangelists,	15	15	21
School-Teachers,	6	54	45
Colporteurs,	—	—	7
Regular hearers,	?	3335	4987
Occasional hearers,	?	9000	33,186
Communicants,	?	1910	2911
Day-scholars,	?	1589	1789
Sunday-school pupils,	?	969	1645
Contributions for all purposes,	Fr.0.00	9504.17	49,469.76

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

The marks of interrogation serve to indicate that in 1860 the reports did not give complete statistics; indeed, these have become more and more complete every year, and their accuracy can be fully depended upon. I call attention especially to the wonderful advance in the amount of the contributions, which have increased fivefold in the course of ten years, showing that the new converts are made fully to understand, and are quite willing to perform their duty to do their best in maintaining their own churches. Every one of our mission congregations is bound to contribute for three different objects: their own poor, their own local expenses (rent, light, &c.), and the central fund. Although trade has been very bad in Italy (and perhaps worse than anywhere else), the contributions of 1880 show a remarkable increase over those of the preceding years.

When the review of the outside work of the Church was finished, the Synod turned their attention to the home work, in the Waldensian Valleys themselves. The report first takes up the spiritual condition of the people, and contains a review of the state and wants of the different parishes; then it goes on to speak of education in its different branches. In this case also, besides the printed report, there was read another which had been prepared by a committee of inquiry elected beforehand. I will notice a few points only.

The first is the progress made by the *Fund for the Increase of the Ministers' Stipends*. I said last year that this fund has met with very great and unexpected success. I may now add that the Waldensians generally have done what they had promised to do, and more. The subscriptions will be closed in a year, and then it is to be hoped that our poor mountain pastors will have the stipend of nearly one hundred pounds, which will provide, not luxury, but the main necessities of life.

Another most interesting fact connected with the late Synod is the creation of *two new ministerial charges* in the Valleys themselves. This was mainly due to the generous initiative of a young Waldensian, Mr. Paul Meille, of Turin, who, having fallen heir to a considerable fortune, offered two sums of £60 a-year each to the parishes of Torre-Pellice and Perrero, on condition that each should collect £20 more, in order to have a new pastor. This generous offer was thankfully accepted, and the Synod had to perform the agreeable office of sanctioning the erection of these two new charges, which will greatly relieve the overburdened pastors of these two parishes. The same gentleman has given an annual grant of 500fr. (£20) to the funds for increasing the ministers' stipends, for pensioning the ministers' widows, and for the retiring pensions of schoolmasters. It would be a most desirable thing if many Waldensians, whom God has blessed with temporal means, were to follow such an example. I may also mention here that the late Mrs. Revel left the largest share of the little she had to the Waldensian Church, to be divided equally between the School of Theology in Florence, and the Orphanage at Torre-Pellice. It gives me pleasure to note, along with the many generous gifts from abroad, those which are of Waldensian origin, and which may stir others in our Church to similar liberality.

The Synod had to make a most important decision on the subject of the College, or High-School, of La Tour. The fact is, that the Government, applying the law with the utmost possible rigour, threatened not only to withdraw its annual subsidy of about £100, but eventually to shut the institution, unless it was organised exactly in the same way as the State establishments of a similar character. With these demands, although many deemed them excessive, it was thought wiser to comply. Henceforth the College of La Tour will have its Gymnasium, with five years, and its Lycæum with three years of teaching. All the lessons will be given in Italian, excepting those on the French language and literature; the programme will be that of the Government schools of the same grade. But as such a course would not quite fit our young men for the theological seminary of Florence, the Synod decided to add, to the eight years imposed by law, a ninth year of study expressly devoted to the Greek Testament, Hebrew Grammar, and other studies, preparatory to those which are prosecuted in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

Florence. This will have the effect of reducing for a time the number of students in Florence, because the six or eight new ones who were ready to come this year will have to stay at Torre-Pellice for their preparatory course. This delay will only give us better prepared students, and there is every reason to hope that the changes which have been made in our College will in the end be most beneficial to the Church.

I may further mention, among the things that occupied the attention of the Synod, a very excellent report on Discipline, and the way to carry it out in the Waldensian Church, by the Rev. Enrico Bosio, pastor of San Germano. An old minister truly remarked that he had not for many years listened to anything that gave him more pleasure than the reading of this report by the young and able secretary. It gave rise, not to a discussion, but to a lengthened conversation on that most important topic. It will be printed and largely circulated amongst the churches—the best way to make it useful. It is not by Synodical decrees, but by enlightening public opinion in the Church that all these important questions can be advanced. The Rev. Mr. Miller, of Genoa, understood this well when, at this Synod, he proposed two prizes for the writing of a popular but at the same time exhaustive little book, on the duty of each Christian to contribute for the maintenance of his own Church. It must be written with a special view to the peculiar conditions of the Waldensian population, and will no doubt be very useful in teaching many of our people that most important duty.

Coming now to a more general subject, I will mention the tenth anniversary of the taking of Rome by the Italian troops on the 20th September, 1870. It was celebrated throughout Italy, but mainly in Rome, with great enthusiasm. And indeed it was right to do so; for these ten years, in spite of many mistakes, failures, and errors, have done a great deal to strengthen the new order of things in Italy. The ground gained in the public opinion of the whole civilised world, by the young monarchy, has been lost by the Pope, who finds himself more alone and abandoned than ever. What power is now ready to take up his cause? And, on the other hand, what power is there that would consent to the re-opening of the so vexed Roman question? Who speaks of it now? Leo XIII., in spite of all his ability, besides the quarrels he inherited from his predecessor with Russia, Germany, and Switzerland, has managed to fall out with Belgium and France. None is so poor as to do him reverence, and he must content himself with blessing the *trousseau* of the infant princesses of Spain. There seems nothing else for him to do in the diplomatic world.

EGYPT.

By the Rev. Dr. G. LANSING, of the American Mission, Cairo.

IN giving a few facts of our Egyptian experience, with statistics of the present state of the Mission, we shall take it for granted that our readers have before them, or can obtain access to the short exposition of our Egyptian system, as contained in the paper read before the Council at Edinburgh three years ago, and published in the "Report of Proceedings of the Council, p. 162."

The custom of our Egyptian Presbytery is to meet from year to year, the meeting being held in early spring, so that the reports and transactions may reach our General Assembly in time for its annual meeting, which begins on the third Thursday of May. A supplementary meeting is held in the end of summer; this is called by the Moderator at such time as may best suit the convenience of members, and with special reference to arrangements for the "winter campaign." *Pro re nata* meetings are also called for ordinations, or any special unforeseen business that may turn up. We have also a committee of supervision, which, we suppose, might in some countries be called a "Commission of Presbytery;" its business is to see to the carrying out of the decisions of the Presbytery, and attend

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

to any other matters which may arise, and which, according to our constitution, it may be competent to perform in the interval between one regular meeting and another. This committee is composed of two American missionaries, two native pastors, and three native elders, provision being made for their retirement from office, and having their places supplied by new members in rotation.

Our last annual meeting was held at Osiout (270 miles above Cairo). Our Presbytery was composed of 24 members, of whom 8 are American missionaries, 5 native pastors, and 11 native elders, representing the eleven native churches. I am happy to be able to say, that since our meeting, two have been added to our number of organised congregations.

At our recent meeting, one of the missionaries, one of the native pastors, and three of the elders were absent from illness and other justifiable causes. Our sessions were characterised by a few note-worthy features.

1st, Their laboriousness. We usually had three meetings a-day—the Presbytery meeting in the forenoons and afternoons, and the Missionary Association in the evening. The latter is composed only of the American missionaries, and has to do with all questions connected with the missionaries, their relations to the Board of Missions and the Church at home, and the disposal of all funds received from the home Church; also with those departments of missionary work which have not yet been handed over to the Presbytery—as the college, the two boarding schools for girls, and the theological seminary.

As regards the seminary, everything at present pertaining to the choice, examination, licensure, and ordination of the students, as well as their employment in evangelistic work during their vacations of study, is regulated by the Presbytery; while the arrangement of the curriculum of studies pursued, and the whole management of the seminary, is undertaken by the Missionary Association, three of the missionaries being appointed as Theological Professors, and assisted in this work by others of the missionaries as they have opportunity.

At the opening of the meeting, the following four committees were appointed:—*1st*, On reports and petitions from churches, stations, &c.; *2nd*, On papers from individuals, native agents, students, &c.; *3rd*, The Judiciary Committee, to which papers relating to the law and order of the church, and cases of discipline are referred; *4th*, On records, to which the church books of the organised churches are referred. These Committees performed their work, as far as possible, in the intervals of the regular sessions of the Court, and it will be inferred that they had enough to do when we state, on the authority of our clerk, that to the first committee were referred 38 papers; to the second, 18; to the third, 2; and to the fourth, the records of 7 of the churches. The reports of these committees were then passed in review, and acted upon in full Presbytery. This, of course, involved the arranging and settling of the work for the year, throughout the whole field; the distribution of the available working force; the amounts of money to be received from the churches and stations, and the amounts to be asked from the American Church through the Missionary Association; and this work is so thoroughly done, that, at the final meeting of the Association, when the schedule of the Clerk of Presbytery is sent in, with the requests for the amounts of money needed from the American Church for the work of the Presbytery for the year, it is usually passed in one vote, and without discussion.

2nd, Our meetings have been characterised by a marked degree of unanimity. We do not always at once agree in opinion and sentiment, and we have had our keen discussions; but before the time for decision comes, we generally see pretty nearly “eye to eye,” and in the end have had very few divided votes. This, however, is not due to any want of independence of mind on the part of our native brethren. Our Presbytery had only been organised two years when a question arose, exciting very strong local feelings. It was keenly contested, and finally carried by a very close vote, the missionaries voting almost in a body on one side, and the natives on the other. I remember it the more vividly, because personally I was deeply interested, and was, unfortunately, on the losing—viz., the Mis-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1880.]

sionary side of the house. Before we left the room, however, we (metaphorically) kissed heads, and no sting was left behind. At the same time, our native brethren have shown a becoming modesty. The rule according to which, from the first, we tacitly agreed to act in the choice of Moderator, is that of rotation according to seniority in the ministry; but last year this rule was departed from, at the request of the native members, in favour of one of the American missionaries. So, also, after the Clerkship had been for four years in the hands of the natives (it being thought more fitting that they should hold the office, as all our records are kept in Arabic), at our last election, by special request from them, one of our own number was appointed. In both cases, the reason which they gave was that they were yet inexperienced, and wished to learn from us.

3rd, Our meetings show a considerable degree of devotional spirit. The first half-hour of each morning session is spent in devotional exercises, led by the Moderator, or some one appointed by him; and every evening for an hour, commencing at sunset, a meeting is held for the discussion of some practical question previously appointed, the public being specially invited to attend. All ordinary meetings are also held with open doors, except when circumstances require that the "house be cleared," and a considerable number of spectators show their interest by attending.

While we rejoice with trembling, not knowing how soon some root of bitterness may spring up in our midst, we can still say with thankfulness, that hitherto our mixed Missionary Presbytery has been a success; and if, hereafter, troubles arise, we believe it will be the fault, not of the method which we have adopted, but of the men administering it.

The following are our statistics for the past three years, as made out by our Clerk:—

STATISTICS OF THE PRESBYTERY OF EGYPT.

	1877.	1878.	1879.
Organised congregations,	7	8	11
Native ministers,	4	4	6
Foreign missionaries,	8	8	8
Licentiates,	7	7	6
Total labourers, male and female, native and foreign,	129	131	161
Monthly religious services,	990	1056	1152
Attendance at Sabbath-morning services,	1483	1624	1908
Attendance at Sabbath-evening services,	916	1039	1186
Attendance at nightly evangelistic meetings,	537	681	751
Attendance at women's weekly meetings,	92	132	193
Sabbath schools,	37	32	39
Teachers and officers in Sabbath schools,	92	94	127
Average attendance,	1142	1249	1575
Day schools,	33	38	42
Scholars in day schools,	1424	1711	2027
Scholars in boarding schools for girls,	51	58	53
Scholars in training college,	80	118	130
Scholars in theological seminary,	11	6	8
Total of male pupils,	993	1271	1537
Total of female pupils,	568	622	681
Adults learning to read,	476	384	246
Communicants,	845	947	985
Adult baptisms,	3	2	1
Infant baptisms,	110	72	142
Contributions of members,	\$5042	\$5124	\$4952